

Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6200. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of the Westville & Newbold Building & Loan Association, of Westville, N. J., indorsing the exemption of annual income of \$500 when derived from investments in a domestic building and loan association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6201. By Mr. REBER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pottsville, Pa., protesting against the Federal coal bill and the Federal live-stock commission bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6202. Also, petition of Katherine O'Hara, of Pottsville, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6203. By Mr. SHREVE: Communications from Holy Name Society, St. John's Church, Erie, Pa.; Branch No. 65, Knights of St. George, Erie, Pa.; Catholic Women's League, St. John's Church, Erie, Pa.; and Corry Council No. 425, Knights of Columbus, Corry, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

6204. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Council Ste. Anne, No. 357, Tupper Lake, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6205. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the Thomas McDonagh Council for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, Boston, Mass., favoring the recognition of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6206. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring a daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6207. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of the corresponding secretary of the Langhorne Sorosis, of Langhorne, Pa., favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1921.

(Legislative day of Thursday, February 24, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD—POSTMASTERS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, there is a little matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate in the nature of correcting the RECORD of yesterday. I have received this morning from the Postmaster General a letter reading as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1921.

Hon. G. M. HITCHCOCK,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On page 4327 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1921, Senator LODGE states:

"Mr. Cleveland blanketed in 40,000 postmasters at one time." Senator LODGE is in error, as Mr. Cleveland never issued any Executive order classifying postmasters. Mr. Roosevelt, on November 30, 1908, issued an order blanketing postmasters at offices of the fourth class in certain States into the classified service. On October 15, 1912, Mr. Taft issued an order blanketing into the classified service the fourth-class postmasters in the remainder of the States.

Very sincerely,

A. S. BURLESON,
Postmaster General.

The Postmaster General is correct, so far as the RECORD is concerned. The RECORD reports the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as using the language which he quotes, but my personal recollection is that the Senator referred to employees of the Government generally and not to postmasters. However, I have offered this letter of the Postmaster General in order that the RECORD may be corrected and that the Senator from Massachusetts may have the opportunity to correct the typographical error.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I did not say "postmasters." I said "offices." It is a mistake which I ask to have corrected. I very well knew that Mr. Cleveland never issued any order about post offices at all. President Roosevelt and President Taft did. It merely came into my mind when I remembered that first and last Mr. Cleveland, after the offices had been filled, put them under civil service to the number of 40,000, as I recall; but, I repeat, I did not say "postmasters"; I said "offices." President Cleveland never took any such action concerning postmasters, so far as I remember.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules of useless papers devoid of historic interest accumulated in the files of the department, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, to be selected by the Chair. The Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Montana and Mr. FRANCE members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary of the Senate notify the House of Representatives thereof.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The signature of the Vice President was announced to the following enrolled bills, which had previously received the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 8067. An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11572. An act for the relief of the John E. Moore Co.;

H. R. 12045. An act to provide for the conveyance of lots on the low grounds of Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 12634. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Alexanderson; and

H. R. 16100. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

FRENCH COLONIAL TROOPS IN GERMANY.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I have received, as doubtless have many other Senators, a large number of anxious and protesting communications concerning alleged brutalities and atrocities in the occupied portion of Germany by the French Negro colonial troops. There is a report—No. 397—on this question that has been printed as a Senate document. I took the matter up with the Secretary of State, and very promptly received an answer in connection with the matter, which ought, in my judgment, to be printed in the RECORD. It clearly shows, largely on the testimony of American officers and representatives who are near the localities concerned, that these alleged atrocities are mere irresponsible propaganda, untrue in fact, and officially disapproved by the German Government. I ask that the letter from the Secretary of State be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 7, 1921.

In reply refer to WE 862t.01/232.

The Hon. SELDEN P. SPENCER,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 4, 1921, referring to reports of misconduct of French Negro troops in the occupied portion of Germany.

In reply I have the honor to inform you that the department is in receipt of many letters from individuals and from societies concerning this matter, all of which letters are answered at some length in order to correct misunderstandings. As soon as the first complaints were received an investigation was made, and from reports received from diplomatic and American military sources it is understood that there are at the present time no black troop units in the occupied territory, the French having removed such troops some time ago. It is believed, however, that there are certain Algerian and Moroccan troops still employed in the armies of occupation, such troops being Arab or a mixture of Arab, French, and other nationalities, and including a large proportion of purely French soldiers. So far as is known the Germans have made no accusations against the conduct of these troops.

The number of Senegalese troops in the occupied regions was never large. The specific attacks made against them in the German press have in most cases been refuted by investigation or by testimony on the part of responsible Germans, and where individuals have been found guilty they have been promptly punished. The American authorities in the Rhineland state that the stories of atrocities originate not in the occupied territory but in Berlin and appear to be very largely anti-French propaganda. This opinion would appear to be carried out by the fact that the agitation in the United States is carried on largely by the German-language press. Inasmuch as it is the

understanding of the department that there are no Negro troops remaining in the occupied area and no recent examples of misbehavior have been brought forward, it would appear that these reports must be part of a widespread propaganda directed against France.

In response to a request from the Foreign Relations Committee of the House, a complete report on this subject was recently furnished to the committee by the department.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

BAINBRIDGE COLBY.

PROPOSED RECESS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. KING. I think we had better wait until a quorum is present before the Senator submits the unanimous-consent request. Personally I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well; I shall withhold it for the present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, with amendments, the bill (S. 4310) to amend an act entitled "The New Mexico enabling act," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 14158. An act granting the consent of Congress to H. H. Haynes to construct a dike across Mud Slough on Isthmus Inlet, in section 23, township 20 south, range 13 west of Willamette meridian, in Oregon;

H. R. 14669. An act for the consolidation of forest lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 15085. An act to perpetuate the memory of the Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; and

H. R. 15445. An act to provide for the disposition of boron deposits.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 115 and 116 to the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; had agreed to the further conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MAGEE, and Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 4039. An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes";

S. 4554. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal power commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, the use of public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1921;

S. 4710. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of certain trust funds in his possession;

S. 4826. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905;

S. 5000. An act directing the Mississippi River Commission to make an examination and survey of the Atchafalaya, Red, and Black Rivers, and to report plan for protection of their basins from flood waters of the Mississippi River;

S. 5023. An act to provide for the closing of Cedar Road between Quincy Street and Shepherd Street NW., in the District of Columbia;

S. 5030. An act authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphine Street, in said city, across the United States military reservation known as the Jackson Barracks;

H. R. 10074. An act to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15543. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES presented memorials of Marie Antoinette Council, No. 326, of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amerique, of Concord; and Ste. Clarie Council, No. 261, of L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, of Rochester, both in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution of the Boswell Grange, No. 1661, of Somerset County, Pa., favoring legislation to prevent gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. CALDER introduced a bill (S. 5045) to amend section 1 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, as amended, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had to-day approved and signed the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of title 1, of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1900, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Philippines:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands for the fiscal year ended December 30, 1920.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
2 March, 1921.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 14158. An act granting the consent of Congress to H. H. Haynes to construct a dike across Mud Slough on Isthmus Inlet, in section 23, township 26 south, range 13 west, of Willamette meridian in Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce;

H. R. 14669. An act for the consolidation of forest lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands;

H. R. 15085. An act to perpetuate the memory of the Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

H. R. 15445. An act to provide for the disposition of boron deposits; to the Committee on Public Lands.

FORT BELKNAP INDIAN RESERVATION—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H. R. 13225, an act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 2, line 25, of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "lands," insert the word "chiefly";

and on page 10, line 14, after the word "lands," insert the word "chiefly"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES CURTIS,
A. J. GRONNA,
T. J. WALSH.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

HOMER P. SNYDER,
P. P. CAMPBELL,
C. D. CARTER.

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

Mr. MOSES, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred House concurrent resolution 76, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-fifth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1921, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McNary	Smith, Md.
Ball	Gronna	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hale	Myers	Smoot
Brandeggee	Harris	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Harrison	New	Sterling
Capper	Hefflin	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Henderson	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Hitchcock	Owen	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Townsend
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Pittman	Underwood
Edge	Kenyon	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Reed	Warren
France	La Follette	Robinson	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	Williams
Gay	Lodge	Shields	Willis
Gerry	McCumber	Simmons	Wolcott
Glass	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	
Gooding	McLean	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement furnished by the First Assistant Postmaster General, showing very clearly the action of that department of the Government in the execution of the Executive order of the President with reference to postmasters. It is very brief.

Mr. SMOOT. Was it not printed in the RECORD yesterday?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it has not been printed in the RECORD. There was just a summary of figures printed yesterday. This is not a very long statement, but a very clear statement, a very impartial statement, merely giving the action of the department with reference to the execution of the order, and showing that it has been carried out in good faith.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of the same letter. I have no objection to having it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator from North Carolina if the statement contains the Executive order of 1917?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; that is the one it refers to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does it show that order as amended by the order of 1920, or does it show the original order of 1917?

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not able to answer the Senator. It covers the whole case and answers all the matters in controversy, showing what the department has done.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The order of 1917 is very different from the order of 1920. I was hopeful that the Senator's statement would embody not only the order of 1917 but also the order as amended in 1920.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not read the statement very carefully, but it starts out by referring to the order of March 31, 1917. I think it embraces all the orders that relate to the subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have seen the statement, and I am quite sure it covers the order of 1917.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It contains the order of 1917 as originally issued?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The order is not included in the statement; it simply refers to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
February 26, 1921.

Since the President's order of March 31, 1917, applying the nonpartisan civil-service test to the selection of presidential postmasters, appointments to these offices have gone to the candidate first on the list of eligibles furnished by the Civil Service Commission, and the Post Office Department has had no record indicating the political affiliations of the several successful candidates.

The assertion has frequently been made that this order has not been conscientiously administered. To show whether this charge is true and to ascertain just how the application of the civil-service principle has operated in eliminating partisanship and establishing service as the standard of fitness for appointment, the following letter was, on February 12, 1921, addressed to postmasters who have been appointed under this system:

On March 31, 1917, the President issued an Executive order whereby appointments to presidential post offices were made as the result of an open competitive examination, the result thereof being certified by the Civil Service Commission to the Postmaster General, who submitted to the President the name of the highest qualified eligible for appointment, unless it was established that the character or residence of such applicant disqualified him for appointment.

In accordance with this order you were appointed postmaster, the appointment being based solely on merit, as shown by the result of the examination. It is now claimed by some that in making these appointments the department has shown discrimination for political reasons. The department is without knowledge of the political affiliations of those appointed under the Executive order, as politics was not considered. It will be to the interest of the service to demonstrate that there has been an impartial administration of this order. As all appointments have been submitted to the Senate, it can not affect the selection or appointment of anyone, and in order to enable the department to answer this charge, which is unfounded, you will state in the space below your political affiliations.

It is not desired to know how you voted in any particular election or whether you voted for any particular candidate, but the party with which you usually affiliate.

There have been three points of attack upon the Post Office Department in an effort to discredit the sincerity of the President's order applying the civil-service principle to the appointment of residential postmasters. This disposes of the last of these attacks.

The first allegation was that the eligible having the highest standing was set aside and some one of lower standing appointed where party politics could be served by the attack. This charge was disposed of by citation of the record, which showed that of 1,560 appointments then made 1,454 had gone to persons whose names appeared first on the eligible list submitted by the Civil Service Commission, and that where the first eligibles were not appointed it was because of their death, declination, or some disability.

The next false accusation was that the Post Office Department failed to recognize the preference given to ex-service men under the law. In response to a resolution of the Senate on this subject the Postmaster General submitted a list showing the names of applicants for these offices who passed successfully the examination held by the Civil Service Commission. Applicants certified to the commission as entitled to preference on account of military service having been nominated to the Senate for confirmation, the department appointed either first eligibles or gave the preference over first eligibles to veterans according to the demands of the best interest of the service.

The Postmaster General's reply to this resolution gives a list of 218 nominations sent to the Senate, but not confirmed, who were entitled to preference for military service, 90 of the nominees not being the highest eligibles. There is also given a list of 49 who for sufficient reasons were not given preference over the higher eligibles, some having declined or withdrawn their applications, some disqualified by age, some being canceled by the Civil Service Commission, and some for some other disqualifying cause.

The records show statistically that there has been no political bias in making appointments under the President's order of March 31, 1917; that the first eligible has invariably been appointed unless disqualified, and that preference has been given to eligibles with military service except where this could not be done without injury to the service.

Replies have been received from 2,103 postmasters to the letter above set forth, which, of course, removes beyond cavil the question of their party affiliation. These replies cover every State in the Union and show that, including all sections, 1,012 appointees were Democrats, 907 were Republicans, 32 were independent, 10 were Prohibitionists, 3 were Socialists, 129 had no affiliation, and 10 failed to state their affiliation.

Omitting the 11 Southern States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia—overwhelmingly Democratic in their population—the equation stands 598 Democrats, 846 Republicans, 26 independents, 9 Prohibitionists, 3 Socialists, 95 without affiliation, 9 blank, and 6 dead.

Even in the 11 almost solidly Democratic States a considerable number of Republicans received appointment as postmasters under the application of this civil-service order. In Alabama 6 Republicans were appointed postmasters, in Arkansas 5, in Florida 7, in Georgia 6, in Kentucky 5, in Louisiana 4, in Mississippi 1, in North Carolina 9, in South Carolina 2, in Texas 11, and in Virginia 5.

In States where the population is more evenly divided between the two great political parties, the appointment of Republicans frequently preponderated. In California, 33 Republicans and 14 Democrats were appointed; in Colorado, 10 Republicans and 15 Democrats; in Connecticut, 10 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Delaware, 1 Republican and 2 Democrats; in Idaho, 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Illinois, 62 Republicans and 33 Democrats; in Indiana, 19 Republicans and 29 Democrats; in Iowa, 63 Republicans and 19 Democrats; in Kansas, 29 Republicans and 20 Democrats; in Maine, 18 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Maryland, 4 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Massachusetts, 20 Republicans and 6 Democrats; in Michigan, 46 Republicans and 16 Democrats; in Minnesota, 55 Republicans and 15 Democrats; in Missouri, 18 Republicans and 54 Democrats; in Montana, 25 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in Nebraska, 55 Republicans and 21 Democrats; in Nevada, 2 Republicans and 1 Democrat; in New Hampshire, 7 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in New Jersey, 21 Republicans and 11 Democrats; in New Mexico, 3 Republicans and 7 Democrats; in New York, 40 Republicans and 36 Democrats; in North Dakota, 26 Republicans and 16 Democrats; in Ohio, 34 Republicans and 29 Democrats; in Oklahoma, 26 Republicans and 61 Democrats; in Oregon, 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats; in Pennsylvania, 55 Republicans and 37 Democrats; in Rhode Island, 1 Democrat; in South Dakota, 27 Republicans and 18 Democrats; in Tennessee, 8 Republicans and 24 Democrats; in Utah, 4 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in Vermont, 3 Republicans and 3 Democrats; in Washington, 23 Republicans and 10 Democrats; in West Virginia, 10 Republicans and 31 Democrats; in Wisconsin, 54 Republicans and 7 Democrats; and in Wyoming, 10 Republicans and 3 Democrats.

One Prohibitionist, 1 Socialist, and 1 having no affiliation were appointed from California. One Prohibitionist and 1 of no affiliation were appointed from Idaho. In Illinois there were 1 Independent, 1 Prohibitionist, and 7 of no affiliation. In Iowa there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 9 of no affiliation. In Kansas, 1 Prohibitionist and 9 of no affiliation. In Massachusetts, 2 Independents. In Michigan there were 2 Independents and 4 of no affiliation. In Minnesota, 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 7 without affiliation. In Missouri, 1 Independent and 4 without affiliation. In Nebraska there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 11 without affiliation. In New York there were 1 Independent, 1 Socialist, and 3 without affiliation. In Ohio, 2 Independents and 5 without affiliation. In Oklahoma there were 2 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 3 without affiliation. In Texas there were 2 Independents and 8 without affiliation. In South Carolina, 1 Prohibitionist and 1 without affiliation. In Vermont, 1 Independent. Virginia, 2 without affiliation. In Washington, 1 Independent and 1 without affiliation; and in Wisconsin, 3 Independents, 1 Prohibitionist, and 4 without affiliation.

The nonpartisan operation of the President's order applying civil-service rules to these appointments is indicated by the correspondence conveying this information, as well as by the statistics assembled. One postmaster writes, "At time of my appointment I was Republican county chairman," and another says, "Have been Republican county chairman for 10 years." Another Republican postmaster says, "The charge of political discrimination by your department is unfounded."

Another Republican postmaster writes:

I was one of the six who took the examination for this position. I was the only one who was a Republican; the rest were Democrats; two boasted of party influence. I simply took the exam. I had taught in grammar and high school; been superintendent of schools

for 25 years, and for 2 years had been treasurer and head bookkeeper of a corporation doing some thousands of dollars a week of business. I felt if I did not get the position there must be something wrong about "civil service," but I got it, although in the "wrong" party. I never voted a Democratic ticket in my life. * * *

Another Republican writes:

I am returning to-day answer to your inquiry as to my party affiliation. I do not think, however, that the mere statement that I am and always have been a Republican is sufficient answer in my case to the inquiry.

For 40 years I have edited Republican newspapers in * * *. More than 30 of those years I edited newspapers in this city. They were not merely Republican in name. I was regarded as a radical, uncompromising, "stand-pat" Republican. With that record I entered the contest for the * * * post office when it was announced that civil-service rules would govern the appointment.

When the Civil Service Commission made its report, I was the highest on the list, and my name was certified to Postmaster General Burleson, who promptly recommended me for appointment, and President Wilson at once made the appointment as recommended. If there is any question or doubt as to the fairness or consistency of the administration in living up to its pledges in this line, my own case should be sufficient to prove the doubt groundless. I desire to give my testimony as to the absolute fairness of the department in making these appointments.

After stating his party affiliation, one says:

I feel that I should further state that I have affiliated with the Republican Party for the past 20 years.

So far as I have been able to ascertain, the question of politics did not enter into either the examination or my subsequent appointment to this office.

One of those who disavowed any political affiliation said:

The commission certainly never showed political favoritism in my appointment. The other candidate was a Democrat, while I lived with my father, who is a lifelong Republican and has been the judge of every election in this place for 20 years.

Another letter from a Republican shows that a very narrow margin of superiority in his rating was sufficient to secure his appointment. He says:

I wish to state that I was appointed because I made the highest grade in the competitive examination, beating the next highest by only fifty-five one-hundredths of a point.

This appointment came promptly and without the use of any outside influence, and I consider that the department has lived up to the letter and meaning of President Wilson's wise order.

A Republican writes:

I received the appointment, but did not accept; but I always felt that the order was administered impartially.

Another Republican says:

I believe it my duty to express my candid and sincere belief in the impartial administration of the Executive order of March 31, 1917. Long before I received my appointment and up to the present time I have followed through the press the action of the department in making appointments, and it is my frank belief that it has been impartial in every respect.

A postmaster who reports himself as being a Democrat says:

William took the examination at the same time I did. * * * We were competitors for the office. He was an ex-service man, wounded in "no man's land," and a Republican. My standing was much higher than his in the examination, but he was appointed postmaster at this office. I was glad of it; would not have taken the examination had I known he was going to take it. He resigned and I was appointed in his stead.

A Republican writes:

I was treated with absolute fairness in every step of procedure from the time of taking the examination until I received my appointment as postmaster. I shall be glad to render any further aid in this matter that you may see fit to ask. The merit system as established by Executive order should be retained as a permanent thing or part in the Postal Service.

An Independent writes:

The records of the department will show that my appointment was bitterly opposed by the pie-eating Democrats and endorsed by the leading business men regardless of political faith. * * * On account of this opposition there was one or more investigations, and your inspector called on every business house in the city and got a personal expression from them on my appointment. * * *

Have voted for the following men: Bryan, President Wilson, Senator Capper for governor and Senator, and Gov. Allen. This is why I was not considered a deserving Democrat, and the chairman of the Democratic central committee did all in his power to prevent my appointment.

Another postmaster says:

I have always been a Republican, first, last, and all the time, and nothing was said in my application or any correspondence from the department relative to my politics, and if the matter was ever discussed at any time I had no knowledge of it and am sure that the department did not know my party affiliation at the time of my appointment.

One postmaster says that prior to his appointment it had been reported in his community that appointments were being made without regard to the civil-service order, and that he was urged to believe that he would stand no chance of appointment on account of not being a Democrat:

I refused to believe such information—

he says—

for, having read the Executive order very carefully, I reached only one conclusion, that merit alone would be the deciding factor. And the results proved my decision, for had it not been for the Executive order

under which I took my examination with an equal opportunity with all the other candidates, I would not be the postmaster at ——— to-day. For, being a Republican, I would have had no chance if the matter was to be decided politically.

I am frank to say that I fail to see where there are any facts to base this criticism upon. In fact, if it was to be political and one party favored, then why was the order issued?

In the judgment of the writer, while a Republican, and should any changes be made, the postmaster stands in line for continuous service, yet I believe the order was one of the finest things issued from the Executive Office, for it removes all political squabbles for the postmasterships and places them upon a competitive basis. The result will be, not as often would happen, incompetency, but highest efficiency. I sincerely hope that the new administration will go one step further and place the postmasters under the classified civil service. This will be a great step forward.

I will further add that when I took my examination I was warned in writing by the commission not to mention religion or politics anywhere. It would certainly be of interest and value, I think, if the result of your inquiry could be sent to all the postmasters.

Another Republican whose appointment came as a surprise says:

The inclosed communication does not call for more information than stated on the blank spaces, but I think my case is just a little different than most appointments. I served four terms as postmaster in this office from 1898 to 1914. When the postmaster who succeeded me resigned I was requested by patrons of the office to take up the examination. I could not see any reason for appointing a Republican, but to test the new rule of civil service I submitted my papers and was very much surprised when I received notice that I was at the head of the list and was appointed postmaster. There certainly was no political influence in my case. Had I known that the Post Office appointments were going back to politics, I never would have given up a good position to come back.

Another says:

I desire to advise that absolutely no political, religious, or fraternal affiliations were mentioned in the appointment of the postmaster at * * *. I have been a lifelong Republican and received my appointment solely on merit after passing the highest grade in the civil service examination for the position.

One postmaster says:

I am in possession of three commissions signed by Republican Presidents for postmaster at another office of the third class, and at the examination held for postmaster at * * * the other applicant was a Democrat and chairman of the precinct committee, so I can truthfully state that there was no discrimination shown in this case for political or other reasons. The Hon. Frank W. Mondell will verify that he has recommended me to the previous appointments as postmaster under a Republican administration, and am satisfied that the ruling of March 31, 1917, was strictly adhered to in this case. Any further information will be cheerfully supplied.

One of the postmasters who is a Democrat writes:

I am glad to state that in making my appointment the department adhered strictly to the presidential order of March 31, 1917. The department had no knowledge at that time of my party preference, as I made no reference thereto on the papers I submitted with my application. As a matter of fact, I had the combined opposition of both major parties in my own town, and also the opposition of the Congressman from my district. Had the appointment been made from a political standpoint I certainly would not have received it. My appointment was due to the fact that I received the highest grade in the competitive examination.

An independent says:

Have always been strictly an independent in politics, not affiliated with any political party, but guided entirely by the issues and men presented in each campaign. Have twice voted for a Republican President and three times for a Democratic President. During the past 20 years, with one or two exceptions, I have supported the Republican Members of Congress, and generally speaking have supported the Republican State ticket. At the time I was appointed postmaster here my appointment was strongly opposed by every Democratic politician in the State.

In another instance of a Democrat being appointed the postmaster writes:

When the civil service examination was held to fill the position as postmaster at this office four applicants contested; three Democrats and one Republican.

The Democrat who had the indorsement of the Democratic organization, and who had secured the appointment as acting postmaster at this office, stood third in the examination, and the Republican stood fourth, and I stood first, and in compliance with the Executive order I was nominated for the position.

The department did not know or ask what my political affiliation was. I am convinced I could have never secured the appointment on a political basis.

A Republican writes that he was rejected by the local board in August, 1917 (draft), because of bad eyes and that his attention was called to the President's Executive order relative to the competitive appointment of postmasters and advised to take the examination. Of the four applicants who took the examination, he says:

The other three were affiliated with the Democratic Party and two have been candidates for other offices. I and my father before me have always been affiliated with the Republican Party.

No information was asked of me at any time as to my political affiliations, and I can say further that the Democratic committeemen from this precinct worked for one of the candidates and that a friend of another of the candidates who happened to be at the Capitol, made a special call in the interests of his friend, and I can also say further that one of the applicants also had petitions signed by about 25 asking for his appointment.

A Democrat, explaining how he got into office says (names being omitted):

Politics did not enter into the appointment of the postmaster at * * * in any way.

A Republican had charge of the office at the beginning of the present administration. Soon after his time expired and an examination was held to fill the vacancy.

He * * * and I * * * took the examination. His grade was three or four points higher than mine and he was given the position and held it five years. His health failed and he appointed his son * * * assistant.

The office was then raised to the third class and an examination was held for third-class postmasters to fill the position at * * *. This son * * * and I took the examination. But before the appointment was made * * * resigned to take a better position in a bank and I was appointed postmaster.

There was no politics in it at all. It was not even suggested. The same thing happened at * * *. A Republican and a Democrat took the examination. The Republican was given the position because he passed the best examination.

It is frequently said in letters by postmasters who avow themselves to be Democrats that no political influence was used to secure their appointments and that though they were Democrats their political affiliation was not known or inquired into. One Democrat says:

In connection with the inclosure I might say that I filed my application for the local post office, passed the examination, and was appointed and confirmed without at any time writing or asking anyone either in public or private life for any assistance. My politics could not have been known to anyone handling the matter unless such persons on his own initiative discovered what my politics were and if this was done I do not know anything about it.

One Republican postmaster closes his communication with this suggestion:

The Republican Party will do well to copy the Democratic Party in the matter of post-office appointments. A lot of my friends thought there would be no use for me to take the examination for postmaster on account of being a Republican, but politics did not enter into the matter at all. The Democratic Party has been very fair as far as I am concerned and the Republican Party will make a mistake if the old political spoils system is employed in making post-office appointments.

MEMORIAL OF THE LATE SURG. GEN. GORGAS.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, on February 14 last the Senate granted unanimous consent to print as a public document the memorial speeches on the late Surg. Gen. Gorgas. I have been furnished a photograph of Surg. Gen. Gorgas, but the photograph can not be published with the public document except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. May I inquire of the Senator whether that consent was given in the House or in the Senate?

Mr. HEFLIN. It was given in the Senate on the 14th of February.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government Printing Office can not publish the photograph without a specific order.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Government Printing Office be authorized to reproduce the photograph as a part of the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

INDIAN ALLOTMENTS—VETO MESSAGE.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispose of the bill (H. R. 517) amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914, together with the objections of the President thereto, which was reported last night from the Committee on Indian Affairs. There is no objection to it in any way so far as I know. It was vetoed by the President under an obvious misapprehension. The only change made in the existing law is a provision permitting the amount of \$15—the previous limit—to be raised because of the increased cost of making the drainage and removing the right of an individual to veto the matter. The bill was passed by the House over the President's veto by a vote of 322 to 18, and I think there will be no one in the Senate objecting to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding? The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick]. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I should like the privilege of asking unanimous consent that some Senator who understands the veto message on which we are voting may make some explanation of it. I do not know a thing about it, and I do not care to vote unadvisedly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unfortunately, the rules provide that there can be no discussion or explanation during the calling of the roll.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Not even by unanimous consent? I rose for the purpose of asking unanimous consent that that might be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can not be done even by unanimous consent. After the roll call has started nothing can be done but to continue and conclude the call.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the regular order.

The reading clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], which I transfer to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—67.

Ashurst	Gronna	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Hale	Myers	Smoot
Brandagee	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Heflin	New	Sterling
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Thomas
Dial	Kellogg	Page	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phipps	Underwood
Edge	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Elkins	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
France	La Follette	Robinson	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	Watson
Gerry	Lodge	Shields	Willis
Gooding	McKellar	Simmons	Wolcott
Gore	McNary	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—5.

Gay	McCumber	POINDEXTER	Williams
Harris			

NOT VOTING—24.

Beckham	Fernald	Knox	Pittman
Borah	Glass	McCormick	Sherman
Chamberlain	Henderson	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Smith, Md.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Stanley
Fall	Kendrick	Phelan	Trammell

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum of the Senate being present, and more than two-thirds thereof having voted in the affirmative, the bill becomes a law, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication, with accompanying papers, from the United States Shipping Board in response to Senate resolution No. 413, of December 27, 1920, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the communication from the Shipping Board in response to the resolution passed by the Senate some time ago, requesting certain information, is very short, being but a single page, I ask unanimous consent to have it read to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD, Washington, March 1, 1921.

SIR: Pursuant to directions of the United States Shipping Board, I quote below resolution adopted by said board at a meeting on March 1, 1921:

"Whereas on December 27, 1920, Senator WALTER E. EDGE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 413) to the Senate of the United States, which was considered and agreed to, instructing the United States Shipping Board to submit a report on moneys appropriated from September 7, 1918, to November 30, 1920, on profits, capital, number and description of vessels, system of accounting, contracts of operation, number of employees, etc.; and

"Whereas said resolution was submitted to the general comptroller with instructions to prepare an answer thereto for the board; and

"Whereas said general comptroller's department has since the 1st day of January had in hand most important matters demanding in the interests of the public immediate attention, and thus far has been unable to prepare a complete answer to said Senate resolution 413 as requested by the board; and

"Whereas a report has been prepared by Joseph N. Teal, one of the Commissioners of the United States Shipping Board, covering in substance the facts required by said resolution; and

"Whereas said report has been examined by the general comptroller as well as by members of his staff, and has been approved by him and them as being substantially a correct statement of facts; and

"Whereas said general comptroller has advised the board that said report in substance answers the inquiries in said resolution heretofore referred to, and advises the submission of said report as a proper response thereto.

"Resolved, That the said report prepared by Joseph N. Teal, covering operations of the United States Shipping Board and United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation from September 7, 1918,

to January 1, 1921, be submitted to the Senate as an answer so far as it may be germane to the resolution above referred to."

Two copies of the report referred to in the above-quoted resolution are transmitted herewith.

Respectfully,

JOHN J. FLAHERTY, Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DUTIES OF UNITED STATES JUDGES.

Mr. NELSON. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 5042) to require judges appointed under authority of the United States to devote their entire time to the duties of a judge, and I submit a report (No. 826) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the bill.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 5042, just reported by the Senator from Minnesota, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I do not think it will cause any debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator from South Carolina advises me that if the bill leads to any discussion he will withdraw the request.

Mr. DIAL. Yes, sir.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Under that condition I will not make an objection to it, but I will be compelled to object to the presentation of any other matter save the conference report upon the Agricultural appropriation bill, which I understand has been agreed to except as to two items. The Senator from North Dakota agrees, and will make the request, I understand, that not exceeding 30 minutes be devoted to the consideration of that report.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one word. I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to say, by way of notice, that I will undertake to keep the naval appropriation bill before the Senate continuously until we get a vote on the bill either to pass it or to defeat it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down may I ask him a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator would not be willing to lay aside the bill for a conference report?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There seem to be so many conference reports that they practically operate to blanket and defeat the consideration of the naval appropriation bill. What conference report is it?

Mr. NORRIS. It is the conference report on the Patent Office bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I can assure the Senator that it will lead to a great deal of discussion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator, I think, would not ask me to lay aside the naval appropriation bill under those circumstances. Let us get a vote upon the naval bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Unfortunately I can not assure the Senator that the conference report will lead to no discussion, as the Senator from Utah has just said that it will lead to a great deal of debate; but it ought to be disposed of.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That would amount practically to defeating the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. NORRIS. If we should reach a time when it became obvious that it would be impossible to finish the naval bill, would the Senator then yield for the purpose I have indicated?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will confer with the Senator in that event.

Mr. NORRIS. I should be very glad to have the Senator do so. I do not want, of course, to displace the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am sure the Senator does not.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that I probably can not get the conference report disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, before the Senator from Nebraska takes his seat I should like to ask him what has become of the conference report on the Patent Office bill.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the conference report about which I was talking to the Senator from Washington. I have never been able to get it up, or to get an agreement as to a vote. I will state frankly to the Senator from South Carolina that it looks as though it was going to be impossible to reach a vote on it, because, as the Senator knows, if there should be extended debate on it, it could not be disposed of; and there is promise of a good deal of debate, which, under the existing circumstances, would make it impossible to secure a vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I just want to go on record as saying that I regard this as one of the most important matters that is coming before the Senate, involving, as it does, certain interests of those who have made our country great by discovering and patenting different devices.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Washington, if I may have his attention—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, the bill to which I referred is very short. I should like to have it disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the bill be read, and see if there is any objection to its consideration.

The reading clerk read Senate bill 5042, to require judges appointed under authority of the United States to devote their entire time to the duties of a judge, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the act approved July 30, 1914, entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary,' approved March 3, 1911," is amended to read as follows:

"Every district judge shall reside in the district or one of the districts for which he is appointed and shall devote his entire time to the duties of a judge, and for offending against the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor."

The READING CLERK. The committee reports an amendment on page 1, line 12, following the word "judge," to insert the words "and shall not engage in any other employment or vocation for which he receives compensation."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think this bill needs a little explanation, in view of the fact that it provides a punishment for the disobedience of its provisions. The principal purpose, I suppose, is to prevent a judge from going out on the Chautauqua circuit for pay, or to prevent a judge from engaging in any other business for pay; but the word "compensation" is used. I know judges who live upon farms, and have their little farms outside of the city. They operate their farms at the same time that they are acting as judges. If they should raise a little wheat or a little barley or some potatoes, and sell those potatoes or other products, would they be guilty of an offense for which they ought to be punished?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield, it is evident that there is going to be discussion and debate over this bill, and I object to its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Washington if he is not willing to lay aside the unfinished business so that the conferees may have an opportunity to present the conference report on the Agricultural bill. I know of no one who wants to speak on this conference report except one Senator, a member of the committee. I do not understand that it will take any great length of time. I am anxious to have it disposed of this morning, because I expect to leave the city very soon, and should like to have it disposed of before I do so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On account of the personal accommodation of the Senator from North Dakota, I am particularly glad to give an opportunity for the consideration of the conference report, with the statement that if it leads to prolonged debate I shall insist upon the resumption of the consideration of the naval bill at the expiration of a reasonable length of time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire who is to decide what constitutes "prolonged debate"?

Mr. POINDEXTER. In this instance, Mr. President, I will decide it to the extent of making a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the Chair wants to know. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the naval bill is laid aside until the Senator from Washington desires to resume its consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I present the conference report on the Agricultural bill, and ask for its immediate adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 31, 32, 33, 79, 80, 82, 115, 116, and 119 to the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 79 and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$501,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,649,270"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,147,770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$382,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36,404,259"; and the Senate agree to the same.

A. J. GRONNA,
CHAS. L. McNARY,
E. D. SMITH,
T. P. GORE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SYDNEY ANDERSON,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JAMES F. BYRNES,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, amendment numbered 31 is the free-seed provision. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] desires to address the Senate on that subject, and I do not know whether a separate vote will be asked or not; but on all the others I move that the Senate agree to the action of the conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I realize that this is not an opportune time to discuss at any length—

Mr. GRONNA. I understand that the Senator from Iowa is not opposing agreeing to all the amendments except that numbered 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been no agreement on that, has there?

Mr. KENYON. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there has been an agreement on all.

Mr. KENYON. There has been an agreement by a majority of the conferees, but not by all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have order? This is an important matter.

Mr. KENYON. Tremendously important—this question of free seed. It goes to the very existence of the Republic—in the minds of some Members.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped for order.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the situation is this: The conferees have agreed on all of the amendments. The well-known and notorious free-seed amendment has not been subscribed to by all of the conferees, but it has by a majority. Being one of the conferees, for my part I refused to sign the conference report with the free-seed proposition in it. Now, that is the situation. I am perfectly willing that all of the amendments, except that

one, shall be agreed to, if we can have a vote in the Senate on that.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator if this is not a complete report?

Mr. KENYON. It is a complete report.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, it seems to me the only way to do is either to adopt the report or to reject it.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the conference report is one single question. The report shows that the Senate has receded from its amendment No. 31. The conference report must either be concurred in or it must go back to the conference as a whole. It can not be split up.

Mr. GRONNA. The Chair is correct. That is my understanding. I am perfectly willing to have a vote taken at any time, but I understand that the Senator from Iowa wishes to speak on this motion briefly.

Mr. KENYON. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Chair. If the Senate rejects the conference report, then the conference report, as I understood the Chair—and I think he was correct—goes back to the conference, and in that event it is still in conference?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. And it will come back here. If the Senate disagrees to this report, it will disagree to it because of the seed provision being in the conference report, and it will take only a little while, if this report is rejected, to go back in conference and agree upon that one item.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, as one of the conferees, I should like to make a short statement in reference to this situation.

This item of free seed was voted on by the Senate—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, well, then, I will take the floor in my own time. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. KENYON. I had not started yet.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will start later.

Mr. KENYON. I am sure the Senator will, though perhaps he will not stop as quickly as I shall.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that 30 minutes have been allowed in which to consider this conference report.

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the wrong understanding. The matter is in the hands of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

Mr. HEFLIN. Then I should like to know of the Senator from Washington if at the expiration of 30 minutes, or any number of minutes, he proposes to stop the consideration of the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not specified any particular time, but I think it would be unreasonable to proceed with the discussion here about an item of \$360,000 for free seeds and as a result defeat the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. The reason why I make the inquiry is that if we are going to have only a few minutes I do not think one Senator ought to occupy the floor during the whole time. There are several Senators who would like to say something on the subject.

Mr. KENYON. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Alabama shall proceed now and take all the time he wants.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not want to take the Senator off his feet.

Mr. KENYON. Not at all.

Mr. HEFLIN. I thought if we had only a few minutes that other Senators would like to be heard.

Mr. KENYON. I should be delighted to hear anything that can be said in defense of this free-seed graft, and I am perfectly willing to give up my time to listen to such defense.

Perhaps that language was a little too strong, Mr. President. Now, here is the situation: I presume I am about as much interested in agriculture and the Agricultural bill as any Senator here. I am not willing to engage in a long discussion and defeat the Agricultural bill for a number of reasons—one is the amendment in the bill of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], of which I shall speak in a moment.

Here we have the spectacle, Mr. President, of the dignified Senate of the United States, with a great naval bill before it, and information coming to us of the serious condition of international affairs, pausing to settle the question of free seeds—an edifying spectacle!

That is the only amendment in controversy. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] suggested yesterday that at

the time he entered Congress this question was up. It may run on for ages yet to come, and children yet unborn may be discussing it here in the future. It is always so complicated with something else that you can not get a fair, square expression of the Senate and the House on it, and it is complicated at this time with the proposition of loaning money to farmers in the drought-stricken regions, a proposition which I favored, and which I believe has great merit to it. So when we talk about defeating the free-seeds provision we are met with the proposition, "Do you want to destroy this great amendment in the Agricultural bill giving the Government the power and the right to loan money to the drought-stricken farmers?"

I am amazed, Mr. President, that this item is here. The House committee defeated it; the House put it in on the floor, and they not only put in the old amount of \$240,000, but increased it to \$360,000, and this cheap thing in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of the people who get the seeds has cost this Government at least \$5,000,000 in the last four years. That includes, of course, the burden on the mails.

What I say about it is not in criticism of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], because I think a better representative of the people, a truer friend of the agricultural interests, never sat in this body. But it has come about in this way—

Mr. REED. The Senator perhaps will explain the matter I rose to ask him about. Did I understand him to say that the seeds had cost the people in the last three years \$5,000,000?

Mr. KENYON. I said in the last four years this free-seed distribution had cost the people of the United States over \$5,000,000, not just the purchase of the seed, but that plus the expense of transporting them through the mail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair make an inquiry of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator state that the original bill provided for an appropriation of \$240,000, but that the Senate struck that out and the conferees had put in \$360,000?

Mr. KENYON. No; I did not intend to convey that impression. The House put \$360,000 in the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. The House put \$360,000 in the bill, the Senate committee struck that out altogether, and the Senate sustained the action of the Senate committee; but it was put back in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no change in the amount?

Mr. KENYON. There was no change in the amount. In the Senate we adopted an amendment appropriating \$5,000,000 to be used in loans to farmers for buying seed in the drought-stricken regions. That amendment and the free-seed amendment were the only matters in controversy, practically, before the conferees. The House conferees took the amendment appropriating \$5,000,000 to the House, and the House voted \$2,000,000 for that purpose, leaving nothing then but the free-seed proposition. It was quite apparent, after they had done this, that there would be very much of a weakening on the part of the Senate conferees; and there was. I say that in no spirit of criticism. It is just a plain unvarnished fact. I do not want to criticize the other branch of Congress, and it is against the rules, but there do seem to be men in Congress who care more about this free-seed appropriation than they do about their souls' salvation. So that by reason of this amendment, and the House position on the amendment, we have the free-seed business back in all its glory, and I assume it can not be defeated now, because to defeat it would defeat the entire bill, we will be told, and so the bunko game is put over on us.

If it were not for the virtue of the amendment providing an appropriation to buy seeds in the drought-stricken area, I would not have any hesitancy in standing on this floor and defeating the whole Agricultural appropriation bill, letting it go over to the next Congress and letting the people of the United States understand that with the Treasury almost bankrupt, and scanning every field of taxation, the Congress of the United States, for the privilege of sending out free seeds under a frank, with the name of a Congressman in the corner, was willing to let the bill be defeated. I am embarrassed, and I can not do it because of the virtue of the other amendment. So will others be, and I suppose the thing will go through.

Mr. President, the other day we passed through the Senate a bill to help in sending food which had been donated by the farmers of this country to famine-stricken China, the railroads

to furnish the transportation, and the railway men to furnish their services, yet that bill does not emerge from the other branch of the Congress; and while I am not criticizing them, I will simply say that one branch of Congress, refusing to help in this enterprise of feeding the starving Chinese, insists on \$360,000 for garden seed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, no doubt the Senator intended to refer to it, but I suggest that it would not cost as much to send that food over to those starving people as it will to get and distribute these seeds.

Mr. KENYON. It would not, or anything like it; and they are dying at the rate of something like 7,000 a day, 14,000,000 Chinamen are facing starvation. It is great statesmanship—but I realize that the rules limit a man in talking about it.

A short time ago I read a letter from a Member of Congress to a constituent about the garden seed, and I tried to find the letter, but have not succeeded. It illustrates how this thing is used.

I know everybody holds up his hands in holy horror and says, "Do you mean to insinuate that our constituents are bought with garden seeds? Yours may be, but ours are not. Do you mean to insinuate that distinguished Members of Congress would descend to sending out of packages of garden seed to influence elections?" It does not make much difference how sanctimonious an expression anybody puts on, the people of the United States know that it is used for that purpose. It is cheap. It discredits the American Congress, besides looting the Treasury.

That letter to which I referred ran along something like this, as I remember it:

I am sitting in my office looking out through the window at the cold stone of the Washington Monument. It would be much more beautiful if it were covered with flowers, and as I sit here and look at the cold stone of the Washington Monument, I am somehow or other reminded of that little plot you have back of your home, and how fine it would be if you could have flowers growing there, and a garden producing tomatoes and turnips, and I am turning from the window to write you this letter and send you a few packages of garden seed.

P. S.—Please remember that I will be a candidate for election in the fall.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Always in the closing days of a session the occupants of the galleries forget the rules. They must keep quiet.

Mr. KENYON. I suppose you can go back to the old days of the Prophet Jeremiah and try to justify this habit. He proclaimed that they would sow wheat but would reap thorns, and I believe that the time has come in this country when, trivial as this thing may seem, those who sow it for votes will reap exactly the opposite.

The branches of some of the legislatures in this country have passed resolutions denouncing this thing. We are always met with the old argument of how it will help some poor person to get a garden. If it did help in that way, I would have less objection to it; if it helped the school children to a love of flowers, and made happier homes and better wives, and healthier babies, as we will be told, I would have less objection to it. We have the same old thing year after year—the same hoary-headed old petty, penurious, pestiferous graft.

Some interesting letters have been sent at different times to Members of Congress about the seeds. One Congressman received a letter from one of his constituents, to whom he had sent a package of garden seed, which read as follows:

Send me another package of beans. My wife made bean soup out of the last ones you sent and we had it last night for supper. It was great.

This is always claimed to be put in for the benefit of the farmer, and the great friends of the farmer here—some of whom, when we had the packer bill up, seeking to stop the robbery of the American farmer by the control of the market place, were found side by side with the packers—will undoubtedly be now talking about the farmer. They say we ought to do this little something for the farmer. Here is what one farmer wrote to a Congressman:

It is nauseating to us to see the Government spending millions of good dollars for a worthless article, and it is surely disgusting to see a Member of Congress trying to perpetuate himself in office by handing out such a worthless sop to his constituents. A match or a toothpick has some real value and wouldn't cost the Government so much, and we have no doubt would be used by a majority of the recipients, where not one-tenth of the seeds ever get into the ground, and when they do are a detriment to the planter. It is hoped that we will have a Congress some day that won't go to "seed," and one that will realize that voters can not be influenced by any such cheap methods.

While this may fail now by reason of these complications, with a new Congress pledged to economy, I hope it will be one of the first things they will take hold of.

What are you going to send out to the women voters—vanity boxes, rouge rags, and other things suggested by Senators

around me? Are you going into the business of using public money to carry on these trivial campaigns? Let us do something for the women. Send them flowers through the mail, or feathers for their hats, or something. It is just as sensible as this. It is unjust discrimination; though it is claimed, I think, that the women like to get these garden seed to plant a wonderful garden, blest by the fall of the rain and the sunshine, growing up to bless the memory of the Congressman who never forgets his constituents and the children wandering amidst the flowers murmuring "God bless our Congressman."

When you come to the farmer question, and argue that the farmers want these, I enter my emphatic denial. It may be that in some cities there may be some little good done by the development of the taste for flowers among children by gardening, but you can go to the corner grocery and get seeds for 5 cents a package just as well as to have the Government pass them out.

I desire to read, on the subject of the farmer, for I know that is what we are going to hear about, a short editorial from Henry Wallace's Farmer. If there is a man in the country entitled to speak for the farmer, it is Henry Wallace. He is to be the next Secretary of Agriculture, and the President elect could not have found a better one in the whole United States. I wish to say that the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, a splendid man who comes from Iowa, not the mother of Presidents, but the mother of Secretaries of Agriculture, has denounced this whole thing, and has called on Congress to stop it. He has gone out and in speeches denounced it throughout the country. What kind of process does the Congress need to get this idea out of its head? Here is what Henry Wallace's Farmer said:

We felt like throwing up our hat and shouting a few hallelujahs when we read in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture that he would ask Congress not to make an appropriation for the free distribution of garden seed as usually conducted. We hope he will be able to persuade Congress to give up this hoary graft.

He is a Scotchman who speaks out what he thinks.

Long years ago, before there was any Agricultural Department, Congress made an appropriation for the free distribution of seeds. There was necessity for it then; there is no such necessity now. Ever since that time Congress has been appropriating, we don't know how much money, but probably, including the expense, from a quarter to a half million each year, to enable Congressmen to frank some common garden seeds—which sometimes would grow—to farmers who had exactly the same kind of seeds growing in their own gardens year after year.

It was a very nice, easy way for the Congressman to make the lady of the farm believe he was thinking of her and sending her a present through the mails each year.

The Secretary proposes to carry out the original idea of the grant—to get rare and valuable seeds and plants for different localities, which can be tested out in these localities, to ascertain whether they are suitable to the soil and climate. The best way to do this is through the experiment stations.

Speaking generally, the farmers have been disgusted with this business, to our certain knowledge, for about 20 years, yet it still continues. It is nothing but a bit of congressional graft which the Congressman is not willing to give up. We doubt whether the present administration, with all its power, will be able to shut off this petty, little, playunish graft, this delicate reminder to the voter that his Congressman at Washington is lying awake nights thinking about him and his wife and his family and his farm. We certainly wish the Secretary success in this most desirable reform. The good wife on the farm will have no trouble in getting beans and peas and carrots and radishes and "yarbs" and "garden sass" without any help from Congress or the Congressman, and without any obligations to him.

That is the farmer viewpoint, not the farmer politician, not the farmer Congressman and Senator, who tries to farm the farmer with cheap talk, but the actual man out on the farm.

I desire to read from an editorial in a leading paper of the country, the Marshalltown Times-Republican, on this subject, as follows:

By their seeds ye shall know them. Congress has adjourned. It passed the usual appropriation bill and made the customary distribution of worthless seeds to the voters as a cheap sop for past loyalty.

If every recipient of garden seeds would plant them and then vote accordingly at the next congressional election, what a world of new faces would be noticeable in the Halls of Congress. We tried planting some of them several years ago with the following result:

The lettuce seed brought forth fruit in the form of leaves about as thick as a cabbage leaf and of a texture resembling a palm-leaf fan. We had had visions of the tender, succulent variety, but, although I have just paid a \$50 dentist bill, I was unable to make any noticeable impression. We took some to an old lady who had the reputation of having more jaw action than anyone in town and told her if she liked it to come over—we had a plenty. She never came. I spoke to a friend that had a corn shredder, but he refused to give it a try out, as the machinery was not guaranteed against anything tougher than a dried cornstalk. We then conceived the idea that a valuable forage crop had been overlooked and so fed some to the cow, and for weeks we could see her, even in her leisure moments, in a masterly attempt to put it away for keeps. The result was that we fed her on bran mash for two weeks to enable her to rest up and be normal.

RADISH OF HOLLOW VARIETY.

The radishes were of the not uncommon hollow variety. If you ate them without peeling, you were apt to come to the conclusion that you were eating horse-radish. If you peeled them, you wondered how the wood-pulp manufacturers had overlooked such a promising raw material.

The onions were in size about like a school boy's assortment of marbles, but what they lacked in size they made up in strength. If you

would give it a moment's thought, you would probably come to the same conclusion that I did, and that is, Congress had them bred up to take the place of whisky killers.

One day we had congressional salad from these selfsame vegetables, with appropriate dressing. They say time dulls all memories, but that salad still holds a vivid place in my memory, and I never will forget the Congressman responsible for sending the seed except when in the election booth. By their seeds ye shall know them.

That is the farcical situation over the country, the general opinion of people about the seeds.

Now, Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate further on this matter. It is considered a small thing. We are not permitted to save money in large things. If we try to save any on the naval appropriation bill, we are accused of not being willing to defend our country. We are not permitted to save any money in the small things; they are too trivial; and so we go on, and there never seems to be any place to commence. If there ever is a good place to commence, it is right here and now on this article, to save the country at least \$1,000,000 a year. If we take the small things like this, and keep piling them up, possibly we would get somewhere in the matter of saving. I do not know what we are coming to. Men seem willing to vote for anything here. The poor old Treasury of the United States has few defenders, and one of its greatest defenders is going out of this body in a few days.

It is a joke. We laugh about this and go on voting for it. We have it so complicated every year with something else that we ought to pass that we can not defeat it. That is the trouble in the Congress. We are compelled sometimes to vote for things we do not believe in to get the thing that we must have.

I have sometimes thought that for the few years I expect to remain here I would support appropriation bills absolutely essential to carry on the Government and fight all the rest of them. I am intensely interested in certain great humanitarian progressive questions that come before the American Congress, and have voted for them. I think we shall have to call a halt on practically everything for a few years and see if we can not cut down the enormous expenses of the Government. If we feel we must have something in the home or on the farm or in the place of business that we may be able to get along a few years without; thrifty people do that and wait and scrimp and save. It seems to me we have to reach that point pretty soon with the Government and the Treasury of the United States.

How can anyone condemn any appropriation out of the Federal Treasury if we go on and appropriate \$360,000 for garden seed? It is the crowning farce of congressional action.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I always listen with a great deal of interest to the able and distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. I can not agree with the argument that he advances. If there ever was a time when Congress should continue the seed distribution that time is now. If there ever was a time when the people need the little bit of seed that the Government distributes that time is now.

The Senator reminds us of some Republican who received a package of beans and used them in making himself some soup, and he straightway wrote back to his Member of Congress for more beans. I submit that since the Republican Party carried the country last fall very few people have even had bean soup, and if conditions get much worse the Government in all probability will have to send beans to all of them.

When I hear Senators without even batting an eye speak of appropriating money in millions and hundreds of millions and then get up here and quibble about giving to the whole population of the United States \$360,000 for rare vegetable and field seeds, I confess that I can not reconcile the two positions. The Senator from Iowa is worrying and worrying about this thing of distributing seed. Some one has said that worry is forethought gone to seed, and I am opposed to distributing that kind of seed. We have been told for a long, long time that he who makes two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before is a benefactor, and I submit to the Senator from Iowa that we now distribute some very fine grass seed, and I want to see the time come when we can make four blades of grass to grow where only one grew before.

The Congress a few years ago—and I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture in the House at the time—provided for obtaining choice field seeds, rare seeds of various kinds, to be distributed throughout the country.

I submit that that was a good thing. If the farmers of Iowa or of North Dakota develop a fine seed of some variety it is well for the seed to come to Washington and be distributed, so the farmers of the East and of the South and of the North might have the opportunity of planting such seed, and that has been done. We have distributed seeds after that fashion.

Garden seed? If I could take the Senator from Iowa down into my State to the garden spot of Dixie, and let him see those big, luscious tomatoes, grown from seeds sent from the Agricul-

tural Department here; if I could let him enjoy some of the beans produced from seeds distributed from Washington, he would forget all of his worry about this little package of seed that goes to the farmer; he would rejoice that he failed, as he will fail to-day, in striking down this provision for seed distribution.

The Senator tells us that when the new Members come into the House they will strike down the free-seed distribution. I invite him now to watch them hit the seed-distribution trail.

Mr. KENYON. I did not want to predict that; I am hoping that they will; but I have my doubts.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad the Senator from Iowa does not predict it for it is not going to come to pass, because when they get here and begin to get letters from their constituents telling them "You are a new Member, and I trust that you will continue to send these seeds as your predecessor has done," that will be the end of that, and the argument of the Senator from Iowa will prove of no avail.

However, the Senator from Iowa reminds me of a Congressman telling his constituents that as he looks upon the Washington Monument, cold and towering in the distance, his mind's eye beholds a little flower garden back home in his district. Yes, Mr. President, there humming birds are sipping the liquid sweets and the bumble bees are buzzing in the blossoms, and the butterflies are floating on the perfumed air, and the curly-haired tots are playing joyously about the yard, while birds are singing in the trees, and yet the Senator would deprive them even of that little plot of flowers the seeds for which the Government has sent out to them. I ask the Senator not to do that; I ask him to permit these flowers to continue to bloom and sweeten the air, to make the birds sing more merrily, and to contribute to the general enjoyment of the household. Not only that, Mr. President, but on these gardens the passersby can look and see rare vegetables revelling in sunshine and shower as they flourish and serve the table of a hundred million constituents.

This item involves an appropriation of only \$360,000, while we have pending here a bill which carries hundreds of millions of dollars; yet, this report is held up here in an effort to deprive the farmers of the country, the good women of the land, and the children who enjoy flowers and vegetables of this small appropriation. It is now desired to take this \$360,000 away from them. Mr. President, I am opposed to such a movement.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama how about watermelon seed? Is he opposed to distributing them?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I am in favor of distributing rare watermelon seed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for a vote on the pending question, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have only one objection to the conference report; that is as to the free-seed item, and the only way that I can express my objection is to vote against the whole conference report.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I desire to make a statement about this matter. There has been considerable discussion on this question, which does not seem to get anywhere. The situation that confronted the conferees was that when this matter was sent to us it came not as the action of the Agricultural Committee of the House, but as the action of the House itself. The provision had not been included in the Agricultural bill by the committee of the House, but when the bill went to the House, by a yeas-and-nays vote the free-seed item was inserted in the bill, as in former years. It then came to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry struck it out. That action on the part of the Senate committee was sustained by the Senate. The bill then went back to the House, as under their new rules it must do, for such action as the House sees fit to take concerning any matter incorporated in a bill by the Senate and referred to the conference. On this particular matter, to which the Senate has disagreed, the House then had another roll call, and the result of that roll call was 198 to 134. That represented quite an increase in the expressed sentiment of the House as compared to the previous roll call. When the matter was returned to conference it was simply a question of deadlocking on this amendment and consequently destroying the Agricultural bill for this session or acceding to an expressed position on the part of the House adopted after a roll call.

I did not deem it a matter of sufficient importance to justify jeopardizing the passage of the Agricultural bill by voting to reject the conference report simply because some Members of

this body, together with outsiders who have written and petitioned this body, think that a coordinate branch of Congress do not know what they are doing or what they want.

Had it been a mere expression by a viva voce vote or had it been a matter that had not had the attention this item has had during all these years, consequent upon the onslaughts made against it, it might have been very well for us to have insisted that the question should be gone into more thoroughly; but every Senator here knows that this subject has been a bone of contention for years, and to jeopardize the passage of this bill by rejecting the conference report upon a matter that we know can not now be settled, seems to me would be to take a very difficult position.

If we are to settle this question, it is for us to give notice to the other coordinate branch of Congress that we will not admit it, not in connection with an agricultural bill in which the item appears, not by a mere expression of opinion here and there without any decided action until the bill comes in, but let us have some preparation; let us discuss this matter as a principle and decide it before it comes to the discussion of a bill of the importance of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there are features in this bill fraught with such interest to the public that we are not justified, even though \$360,000 are appropriated for the distribution of free seed, in jeopardizing the passage of the entire bill on that account. We have before us to-day a bill for the national defense. One would hardly feel justified, if that amount of money is necessary to protect the interests of this country, in jeopardizing the passage of that bill, or in defeating its passage because some minor proposition in it does not meet the approval of certain Senators. It was for these reasons that I acceded to the conference report. I have respect for the opinions of others charged with legislative responsibility, and they, by a majority vote, expressed a desire to have this provision retained in the bill. They have, perhaps, as important reasons for wanting it incorporated as some have for desiring it to be expunged.

I again submit that there has been much talk and expression of opinion, but, perhaps, not a great many know, as a practical fact, what the effect of the seed distribution is. There are those who claim that it does good. I myself am of the opinion that not so much good flows from the distribution either because of the intrinsic value of the seed or of the results obtained by those who plant them as from the fact that it is a means of keeping more or less in touch with that mass of our people who God knows are now far enough away from the great heart of the legislative body. About the only privilege they have is to support those that are higher up, to pay taxes, and receive nothing at all, for, the Senator from Iowa says, the distribution of seeds amounts to nothing; but I know of nothing else outside of this provision and a few other provisions in the agricultural bill that the great masses of the people who feed and clothe the teeming millions of this country get at the hands of the Government. Is there a Senator here who dares say that other industries receive like indifferent treatment? It does not sound very good in view of the notorious benefactions that have been poured out on other classes for us to quibble over this, even though it is admitted that the distribution of the seed amounts to nothing.

It at least is some semblance of a recognition of the fact that the tillers of the soil ought to be recognized by this Government in some form.

This is a poor form, and perhaps unnecessary. I myself should be willing to see it stricken from the bill, not on the ground of economy but simply because I believe that something better could be substituted and some real benefit accorded by the use of this money with an additional appropriation. I recognize the fact, however, that this bill must fail unless we agree to this proposition as a whole, and because of the other splendid matters that are in the bill I shall vote to agree to the conference report; and let me say, Mr. President, that an overwhelming majority of the conferees voted for this report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think it is well for us to understand the exact situation as it confronts us now.

A majority of the Senate have been in favor of abolishing this provision which has been carried for so many years in the Agricultural appropriation bill. In spite of all that may be said, the majority is convinced that there is no reasonable, legitimate argument for its retention; yet Senators rise here, as they have ever since I have been in Congress, in the House and Senate, and say that we must not imperil the other provisions of the bill. How many times that fictitious argument has been used.

I can not imagine that the House of Representatives would allow the agricultural bill to be defeated on account of free seeds. We are coerced into voting every year against our own

judgment, our own convictions, as to what ought to be done. Now, I am in favor of sending this bill back to conference and letting the responsibility rest where it belongs, with those Representatives who would defeat the agricultural bill unless it is furnished the unworthy political capital of free seeds. Send the bill back to conference and then the country shall know who is responsible for failure of the agricultural bill, if it shall fail. But it will not fail if the Senate stands by its convictions.

These seeds do not go to the farmers of the country. The statement that they are given to and demanded by the farmers to any great extent is without foundation of fact. Mr. President, this is what might occur: If the Senate refuses now to concur, and this bill is sent back to conference on this one item alone, the only one in dispute, it will then be up to the House of Representatives to say: "We will defeat the agricultural bill because you do not grant us \$360,000 of seeds to be distributed among our constituents."

So far as I am concerned, while I want the agricultural bill to pass, and while I believe it would pass, it never can pass in the proper form if we surrender every year on the same ground, upon the same arguments that are advanced year after year. Therefore, I trust that this conference report will not be agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate only a minute or two; but I want to suggest to the Members of this body that the defeat of this conference report is the defeat of the Agricultural appropriation bill. I presume that the industries of the country would still go on if this bill were defeated; but we have only recently appropriated \$350,000,000 or \$400,000,000 to the railroads of the country. It was probably necessary. It was due on an obligation and had to be paid. This bill takes care of a great many things in all the departments of agriculture. No one was more opposed to the free-seed provision than I. In fact, the committee unanimously voted to strike out the seed provision and the Senate sustained the action of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator really think there was a deep-seated opposition to the free-seed provision by the members of the committee, or were some of them opposed to it and the others just willing to strike it out because we were putting in measures on which we wanted the House to yield; and was this measure really being used, at least in part, to force the House to yield to measures that we thought necessary that they had left out?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, does the Senator make that charge as to the committee? He may have had that in mind.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not make that charge. I asked the Senator a question. I made no charge against the committee. I asked the Senator if he did not think that in part influenced them, and they were not really all so unanimously and urgently against the free-seed item.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no doubt that is correct; but what I want to say is this: Here we appropriate for plant industry; we appropriate for animal industry; moneys are appropriated to take care of tuberculosis among animals throughout the United States to protect the lives of the people as well as the lives of the animals. Now, this appropriation bill is to be defeated because there is \$360,000 here to which we are opposed; and I will confess that I was opposed to it, but my judgment is not superior to that of 435 Members of the House. The House, by a substantial majority, on a record vote, said that they never would agree to the bill unless this free-seed provision remained in the bill. By a vote of 198 to 134 this bill was sent back. I felt, therefore, that it was my duty to bring back this bill to the Senate and let the Senate vote upon it, and I agreed to the conference report, although I am opposed to the free-seed provision.

Mr. President, this bill carries large amounts for fire protection, not only in the western country but throughout the whole United States. In cooperation with the 25 States of this Union, we appropriate several hundred thousand dollars for that purpose. I do not believe that the Senate of the United States is justified in turning down this bill simply because there is opposition to the seed provision; and I hope the Senate will sustain the committee and vote to accept the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not believe that if this conference report is defeated it will jeopardize the bill. It will go back to conference, and the conferees can make a report before this session ends. I want, if possible, this time to have the Senate, now that the disagreement is reduced to one item alone, and that is the free-seed item, to put up to the House of Representatives the question whether they are willing to

defeat this bill in order to save the \$360,000 for free seed. I do not believe they are going to do it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? I do not see how the Senator can stand here and lay the charge of defeating this bill at the door of the other body, when we are assuming the attitude rather than they.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had listened to what I said, he would have known that I said "rather than to have the free-seed appropriation defeated." There is no question but that this bill is now in agreement on the part of both Houses with the exception of the one item, and it will not take very long to have the conference report go back and have a further conference held; and then the fact will be definitely before the House of Representatives that the Senate of the United States is unalterably opposed to this item.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the point I am making is this: Your representatives on the conference committee have agreed. Now, if the bill is defeated because of this item, it can not be charged that the odium of the defeat will lie anywhere except here. Our conferees have agreed. The House is in accord. If you repudiate our action, then the odium of the defeat of the report is here and not there.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest that there is no odium about defeating a bill like this in view of the attitude which the Senate has taken for so many years upon this one item; and that is particularly true when there is an interval of three or four months between now and the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. SMOOT. I know of no better time than the present to bring this question squarely up to the House of Representatives. It would be quite different if this were the close of a fiscal year, with no extra session of Congress in sight, and the appropriations would fall and go over into another fiscal year; but there is no danger of that at all. I do not believe there is any danger but that if this question is put up squarely to the House, and the Senate insists upon its action, the House will recede from its position on this free-seed proposition.

Mr. GRONNA. But the Senator knows that all these items will have to go back, because the agreement is a complete agreement.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, the only thing in dispute to-day is one item, and the report has been agreed to with the exception of that one item.

Mr. GRONNA. We often find people hiding behind a certain thing, but there is always a ghost back of it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not like to interrupt the Senator while he is discussing the bill, but it is evident that this discussion is going on interminably. One speech leads to another. I had hoped that we could get a vote on the conference report and dispose of it one way or the other, but if it is going to lead to so much debate, I shall be compelled to move to take up the naval bill.

Mr. THOMAS and other Senators. Vote!

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I shall be through in two minutes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Then, Mr. President, I want to make one statement to the Senator from Utah, and that is that I, as a conferee, assert that if this bill goes back, not only will that item be in conference, but other items of importance will be in conference, and it means inevitably the defeat of this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the statement of the Senator from South Carolina at least intimates that there has been some agreement between the conferees of the two Houses on items that rest upon the action taken upon free seeds.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have made no such intimation, but I am telling the Senate just what is the fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if there is not any such thing as that, there is no danger, from the statement the Senator made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is just a mere expression of opinion on the part of the Senator from Utah, and I am stating a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not interpret the statement of the Senator from South Carolina in any other way than I have.

Mr. President, I was going to call attention to a number of statements made by Senators here as to a separate bill. This whole item has been in the Agricultural appropriation bill ever since the Agricultural bill was first inaugurated, and you are not going to pass a separate bill through Congress for this pur-

pose. It does not belong in a separate bill. It is a direct appropriation, and it ought to be in an appropriation bill, and that is where it will be if it is to be carried; and nobody is going to suffer if this conference report fails.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. KENYON called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], which I transfer to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], but I understand that he is in favor of this legislation. So I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (after having voted in the negative). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and in his absence I withdraw my vote.

Mr. FERNALD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. On this matter I understand he would vote as I am about to vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX. May I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. KNOX. Having a pair with that Senator, and being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I observe he is not in the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. EDGE (after having voted in the negative). Has the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. EDGE. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma, and it being impossible to secure a transfer, I am compelled to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are paired.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—55.

Ashurst	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	New	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Heflin	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Henderson	Phipps	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Sterling
Dial	Kellogg	Poincxter	Sutherland
Fernald	Kendrick	Pomerene	Swanson
Fletcher	Keyes	Ransdell	Trammell
France	Kirby	Reed	Underwood
Gay	La Follette	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gerry	McCumber	Sheppard	Warren
Gooding	McKellar	Shields	Watson
Gronna	McNary	Slimmons	Wolcott
Hale	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—22.

Borah	Glass	Lenroot	Thomas
Brandegge	Gore	Lodge	Townsend
Calder	Hitchcock	McLean	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Moses	Willis
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	
Elkins	King	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—19.

Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Sherman
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Stanley
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Knox	Penrose	Williams
Fall	McCormick	Phealan	

So the conference report was agreed to.

COURTS IN NEW MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4310) to amend an act entitled "The New Mexico enabling act," which were:

On page 1, line 12, to strike out "circuit and";
On page 1, line 13, to strike out "courts" and insert "court";
On page 2, line 8, to strike out "clerks" and insert "a clerk";
On page 2, line 8, to strike out "courts" and insert "court";
On page 2, line 9, to strike out "their offices" and insert "his office";
On page 2, line 10, to strike out "courts" and insert "court";
On page 2, line 12, to strike out "circuit and";
On page 2, line 12, to strike out "courts" and insert "court";
On page 2, line 13, to strike out "respectively";
On page 2, line 15, to strike out "circuit and";
On page 2, line 15, to strike out "courts" and insert "court";
On page 2, line 18, to strike out "circuit and"; and
On page 2, line 18, to strike out "courts" and insert "court."

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 4310, which proposes to amend an act entitled "The New Mexico enabling act." The House has made some amendments, which do not affect the purpose of the bill as it passed the Senate. I simply desire to move that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House. The bill is merely to change the time for the holding of the terms of the Federal court in New Mexico.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON DECEASED REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, on account of the recent death of one of my colleagues in the House and the fact that the resolutions came over from the House at a late hour in respect to another colleague who has passed away, it is desired at an early date to hold memorial services. We are approaching the closing hours of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that a short time may be set aside this afternoon to offer resolutions in reference to the late JOHN L. BURNETT, of Alabama, and the late FRED L. BLACKMON, of that State, and that a few short speeches may be made. I ask that at 3 o'clock the unfinished business may be laid aside for that purpose. It will not take long to dispose of it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the order will be entered.

MILITARY NOMINATIONS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs has instructed me to report to the Senate a number of nominations for promotion and transfer and original appointment in the Army. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, as in open executive session, to make the report, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It affects no one above the grade of colonel, with the exception of Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre, who is renominated to be Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and who, if not confirmed by noon March 4, will be out of the Army of the United States entirely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection at all to the consideration of the list of Army officers sent in above the rank of captain. In the grade of captain, however, there have been a number of promotions sent in—not original appointments, but promotions—to which I do object, for this reason, that the promotions of first lieutenants and captains are made in compliance with a construction of the Army reorganization act, which construction I do not believe is legal, fair, or just, and I do not believe that such a construction was ever in the contemplation of the House and Senate when they passed the act. Under and by virtue of this construction second lieutenants, without any further examination, are promoted to captains, and promoted over captains having a shorter service on the single list. In other words, there are included in these three branches captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants, on the theory of length of service alone, and all put in hodgepodge, and the man who stood an examination and obtained a captaincy would, by virtue of this construction of the act, be put below a man who had stood examination and became a second lieutenant.

Such a system is entirely unfair. I do not believe such a construction of the act is legal. It ought not to be permitted, and, so far as I can prevent it, I am not going to let it go into effect. For these reasons, briefly stated, I object to the confirmation or the consideration of the confirmation of nominations of captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants. I have no objection whatsoever, indeed, I desire the confirmation of general officers and other officers above the grade of captain whose nominations are presented. I desire to have the colonels, lieutenant colonels, and majors confirmed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think that a great deal of confusion and inconvenience will result if the Senator from Tennessee persists in the objection he has just made. I doubt sincerely whether the confirmation of the officers above the grade of captain can be had if he persists in the objection. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, will understand whether the objection will have any effect on the nominations above the classes objected to.

The Senate has had great difficulty in acting upon these nominations. There are still other nominations for promotions to higher grades which, in my opinion, ought to be disposed of, and a little later I may take occasion again to express my views on that subject. The purpose I have in mind now is to suggest to my friend the Senator from Tennessee that if the objection is persisted in it may have the effect of disarranging the agreement that has been reached respecting several thousand nominations to military appointments. Of course, I know the Sen-

ator from Tennessee is familiar with the subject, and I know that he appreciates the importance to the Army and to the country of acting upon the nominations. I wish to ask him if he will not withhold his objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my objection can not possibly affect the officers above the grade of captain, because I do not object to the confirmation of any officers above that grade. I favor confirmation of officers nominated to these higher grades. My objection can not possibly have any effect upon the nomination of officers whom the Senator has mentioned; not at all.

As I have tried to explain on one or two occasions, my objection to these nominations is this: Under the construction of the Army reorganization act we will have practically no lieutenants in the Army. We will have no second lieutenants at all, and we will have very few first lieutenants. I think that with an Army such as we have we ought to have a proper number of lieutenants. These nominations deprive the Army of lieutenants. This ought not to be done. In the late war lieutenants played a very conspicuous part in the fighting. There is no necessity for being in a hurry about these nominations. No one will be hurt if they are not confirmed at this session. I believe the Congress, whenever the matter is brought to the attention of the two Houses, will correct this erroneous construction of the act that the War Department has placed upon it, by which majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels are placed on the single list of promotions with respect to their grades, but by which those below—captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants—are put in a hodgepodge and all promoted according to length of service and in accordance with the result of open and fair examination had. If a second lieutenant has a longer service by one day than a captain, under this remarkable construction of the act, he is promoted over the captain on the single list, and I understand sometimes it has been figured out that under this appointment plan there will be second lieutenants promoted more than 2,000 numbers over a captain who was appointed a captain as a result of what was substantially a competitive examination.

I wish to call the attention of the Senator from New York to what the effect is going to be. In the Air Service, for instance, and in various other services as well, especially in the technical service, a man who accepted a captaincy would not have accepted the lower grades, would not have accepted a second lieutenantcy or even a first lieutenantcy if he had known this construction of the act by the department was going to be made. In many instances first and second lieutenants will be promoted over captains. When I say promoted over them, I do not mean exactly promoted, but I mean they will be placed ahead of captains on the promotion or so-called single list, which is really a promotion over the men who have earned their captaincies, who went in and stood the examinations. Four different boards passed upon the qualifications of these captains, their educational, physical and mental qualifications, and their records of actual service in the Army, and those boards have said that certain of these men shall be captains and certain of them shall be first lieutenants and certain others shall be second lieutenants. They have determined this after the most careful and painstaking examinations and investigations. And here comes the department, by a ruling and by an erroneous construction of the act, and upsets the results of all these examinations and makes the act of Congress nugatory.

Under this construction which has been placed upon the law by the Army authorities, they have said that these examining boards had nothing to do with determining who should be captains and who should be lieutenants; that the second lieutenant who has had a longer service than a captain was entitled to be promoted over the captain on the single list, regardless of what the examining boards determined. That is an intolerable construction of the act—unfair to the men and unfair to the Army itself—because, after having made these selections, these four boards having made the selections, the Congress ought to stand by them; and I do not think we ought to take any step that will prevent those who have earned their commissions from getting them and getting their proper place on the single list. For that reason I object to the consideration of these nominations of captains and lieutenants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Objection is made.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to make just a brief statement. The objection which the Senator from Tennessee makes shows that it is in anticipation of difficulties and inequalities and injustices that may arise in promotions hereafter to be made. I suggest that we can meet that objection when the promotions are made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. I have not objected to the confirmation of those above the grade of captain. I have not objected to any general officer, and I have not objected to any major, lieutenant colonel, or colonel. I join in the hope that they may be confirmed. They ought to be confirmed. I am only objecting to those three classes of officers where this injustice will be done.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Tennessee objects to the confirmation of captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, unless these nominations can be disposed of without further debate, I shall have to insist on the regular order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If I may make a statement, I can settle the matter, I believe.

Mr. ROBINSON. I insist that the Senator from New York be permitted to make his statement. He can make it during the consideration of the naval appropriation bill if the Senator from Washington declines to permit him to make it at the present time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to the fact that I have not been interrupting in the matter. I have been trying to get an opportunity for the Senator from New York to make a brief statement.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it will be quite impossible at this time to debate the question about the single list for promotion. Let me simply say that the law upon the subject is as plain as the English language can make it, and that these promotions have been made in strict compliance with the law. The Committee on Military Affairs, with the single exception of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], reached that conclusion at its last regular meeting.

The only way by which the situation can be changed in order to meet the views of the Senator from Tennessee is to amend the law. The Senator from Tennessee has certain views upon the question. I am not going to debate it here and now. I sharply disagree with him. I think the law is right and works out the greatest measure of justice. His objection, however, to captains, first lieutenants, and second lieutenants as affected in this list for promotion is controlling for the time being. It is true that they may not be promoted, and that captains may be promoted to majors, majors to lieutenant colonels, lieutenant colonels to colonels, and no harm done to those particular grades.

Therefore, in view of the situation, which I intend to bring up later if I get an opportunity during the session and endeavor to settle the matter, I now ask unanimous consent that all the nominations for transfers in the Army, the nomination of Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre for Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and nominations for promotions to the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel be considered at this time and that they be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And that the President be notified.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Now, Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WADSWORTH subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just had a consultation with the Senator from Tennessee, and I ask that the order entered this morning with respect to confirmations in the Army be made to include the promotions in the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, and the appointments in the Chaplains Corps. None of them conflict with the ideas of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course that ought to be done. These officers are not affected by the question I raised, and of course it ought to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BONUS FOR EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suppose the regular order is before us at this time. It is evident to me, and I am ready to stand corrected if incorrect, that there is no possibility of enacting the naval appropriation bill into law at this session. Possibly the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] could give me more definite information, but I am assuming at this time that we will

not be able to pass the naval bill. That being the case, I am going to ask that it may be laid aside for the purpose of taking up the soldiers' bonus bill.

There is opportunity for passing the latter bill, provided there is not a prolonged debate, and a determination that it, too, shall not pass during this session. By eliminating the tax portion of the bill the House can immediately vote on it if we pass it through the Senate. Of course, if we had taken up and attempted to dispose of the tax measure to meet the obligation of this bill it would have been impossible to have disposed of it during this session, and perhaps before close to the end of the next session. We therefore eliminated the tax proposal, leaving the tax feature to be determined by the session of Congress which is to meet in April.

To meet the objections of the Treasury Department and possibly the disapproval of the Executive, the Finance Committee put the date of the beginning of the operation of the bill six months after the end of the deficit year mentioned in the Treasurer's report, June 30, 1922, leaving it for the Senate to fix any intermediate date. Personally, I think that January 1, 1922, which would give 10 months to put in action the new machinery necessary to carry the proposed law into effect, would give the American Legion and the department sufficient time to inform soldiers just what their rights were, and which one of the several propositions would be most beneficial to them, and give Congress sufficient time to enact proper revenue legislation.

The report which has been presented by me gives accurate estimates, so that only the question is left of whether or not we want to pass the bill at this time. We know just about what it will cost. We can make a fair estimate of that. We have all the data that we need. I believe if we should consider the bill now all we would have to do would be to fix the date for the first payment thereunder. I have prepared all amendments necessary to conform the bill to any date that the Senate sees fit to fix as the beginning of its operation, leaving the operation of the farm and home provisions and the training provision to take effect immediately, so that if we should agree to enact this measure we could within 20 minutes make every amendment necessary to conform the bill to whatever date we agree would be the best date for the beginning of its operation. But I know that any one or more Senators could prevent the enactment of the bill into law, just as they can prevent the enactment of the naval appropriation bill into law, and there is no use of attempting to press it if there is a determination to prevent action at this time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. There are those in the Senate who are strongly opposed to the bill, and there has been a very strong report in opposition to it made in the Senate. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to ask the Senator a question for information. As the Senator has reported the bonus bill, as I understand, it provides that it shall go into effect in 1923?

Mr. McCUMBER. That the payments, under the cash basis and under the certificate basis, shall go into effect as of January 1, 1923. I have stated that my reason for that was in order to put the date off beyond the time within which the Secretary of the Treasury concluded it would be very unwise to have any payments made, and to meet any possible objection on that ground that might be urged by the President, leaving it for the Senate to adjust any intermediate date.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the very point as to which I wish to ask the Senator. The Senator is in charge of the bill; his proposal will have great weight in the Senate when the bill comes up for consideration; and although he has reported the bill, he fixes the year 1923 as the date when it shall go into effect. He leaves it in doubt as to what the Senate should do. Now, I ask the Senator what he proposes to do; what he stands for?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say candidly, just as I have already stated, that I think, in view of the suggestions that are made in the report as to the means of meeting the obligation, that we could select January 1, 1922, which will be about 10 months from now, as a proper date, and one which would give ample time for us to adjust our revenues to the added obligations and to fund the indebtedness due to us from other countries and give them time to begin the payment of the interest to meet the obligation.

However, the strong reason, I will say, that actuated the committee was the fact that the Treasury Department deemed it very unwise to provide an earlier date, and we felt that possibly the President might have the same view as the Treasury Department, and it might be questionable whether the bill would receive his approval if we did not put the date off as late as this; but with the means suggested of bringing in the

cash to meet the obligation, I can see no reason why the President of the United States should not sign the bill, even if it should go into effect on January 1, 1922.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He probably would do so; but I think before the bill comes before the Senate for consideration the Members of the Senate would want to know what date is going to confront them as to when the obligation would go into effect. As I now understand from the Senator from North Dakota, if the Senate takes up the bill, he would abandon the date fixed by the bill and would propose January 1, 1922.

Mr. McCUMBER. Personally, I would favor January 1, 1922.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is that the position of the committee? Mr. McCUMBER. I can not say; I should not wish to speak for the committee. There is a divergence of views among members of the committee; some feeling that the date ought to be put off even later than 1923. We voted on that proposition, however, and it was voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDGE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. If it is ever enacted, this bill will increase the public indebtedness of the taxpayers of the United States by not less than \$3,500,000,000. The bill was reported on the legislative day of February 24, which day has not yet expired. It must, therefore, under Rule XIV, go over under objection, and I object to its consideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I only wish to say in conclusion, that I think now we have presented all of the facts which are necessary for this Congress or for the next Congress; and that it will not be necessary to have rehearings at the beginning of the next Congress. The bill will be prepared with the tax proposition and the appropriations proposition left out, and reintroduced. My candid opinion is that the bill will pass both Houses during the early part of April of this year, and will go into effect at such date as may be fixed by the two Houses.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I want a ruling upon my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado under the rule has made objection to the consideration of the bill. In the judgment of the Chair, the rules as enacted by the Senate do not contemplate legislative days but rather calendar days.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to be heard upon that, in order to see if I can not convince the Chair to the contrary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the question?

Mr. McCUMBER. I asked the Senator in charge of the pending bill if he would allow me to ask unanimous consent to have the pending bill laid aside to allow the Senate to take up the soldiers' bonus bill? It is rather an appeal to the Senator who has in charge the naval bill for the laying aside of that bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not hear that request; consequently I did not understand the remarks of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota still has the floor. In the meantime he was interrupted by the Senator from Colorado, who, as the Chair understands, made objection to the consideration of the bonus bill at this time. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir; the objection being founded upon Rule XIV.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the objection made is not well founded; that the rules do not contemplate a legislative day, but rather what is known as the calendar day; and that the request is in order at this time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Chair rule, then, that the Senator from North Dakota can have his bill taken up at any time? Is that the effect of the ruling of the Chair? I understood the Senator asked for unanimous consent, and that any Senator could object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not so ruled. The Chair simply intended to answer the question raised by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, as I understand the proposition, the ruling of the Chair is simply this—which is correct—that the rule when it says a bill shall lie over for one day means a calendar day and not a legislative day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me just one moment—and, of course, if that is so, then it is in the power of the Senator in charge of the bill to move to take up his bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But he has not so moved.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He has not done so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. He has asked for unanimous consent, and any Senator can object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has asked unanimous consent to have his bill taken up. The present Presiding Officer will put the request of the Senator from North Dakota. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Before that is done I want the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. I object.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask for the regular order. The request has been made, objection has been entered, and I ask that the naval appropriation bill be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. I think we ought to get the ruling correct, because it is of great importance.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What is the doubt about the ruling, when the request for unanimous consent was made and objection was interposed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present Presiding Officer has not attempted to make a ruling further than to give his opinion as to the question raised by the Senator from Colorado. At the present time the question before the Senate is the request of the Senator from North Dakota for unanimous consent to take up the bonus bill.

Mr. THOMAS. To that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has objected to giving unanimous consent.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am not going to move to take up the bonus bill as against the naval appropriation bill unless I can gain something by so doing, unless I can feel reasonably certain that the bonus bill will not be talked out of existence between now and the close of the session or for such a length of time that it would be impossible to get a conference report back from the House and secure action upon it. Those who are opposed to the measure—and I know they are acting in the best of faith and for what they believe to be the best interests of the country—can say to me whether or not they propose to prevent a final vote upon this bill within such time as may permit it to become a law during the session.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. CALDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCUMBER. I first yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator having yielded to me, I will say that my throat is not in very good condition today, but I will do the best I can.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I believe I was recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from North Dakota had yielded the floor.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; Mr. President, recognizing the fact that when the Senator from Colorado says that he will do the best he can to prevent any action on this bill at this session, I know he is capable of making good his purpose; that being the case, I shall not move to displace the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield the floor?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the merits of the proposed bonus legislation. I believe, however, that the Senate has a prior obligation to the soldiers and the sailors of the World War before they enact bonus legislation, and that is to enact measures which are before this body providing for proper hospital facilities for the wounded and disabled soldiers and the decentralization of the agencies which are now distributing compensation to the wounded soldiers.

I had intended to speak upon that subject and to lay certain facts before the Senate, and also to set forth what I believe is the position of the American Legion in regard to the priority of the legislation to which I have referred. I have refrained from doing so until the Senator from Washington has had a full opportunity to present the naval appropriation bill and an opportunity to pass it if possible. I intend to refrain from speaking on this subject until he has had further opportunity, but before the close of the session I intend to address the Senate and place certain facts before them as to what I believe are the desires of the American Legion in regard to legislation to be enacted by this body. For the present I intend to defer to the Senator from Washington, and to allow him to continue with the naval bill, but I shall seek an opportunity, as I have

stated, before this session adjourns finally to present certain facts to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. To what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am speaking upon the request of the Senator from North Dakota for unanimous consent to consider the proposed bonus legislation.

Mr. CALDER and Mr. JONES of New Mexico addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE COAL SITUATION.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am in accord with the naval bill now pending in the Senate, and am hopeful that before the session ends it may become a law. I believe in the Senate bill, and I am sure the best interests of the country will be served if it is enacted; but I propose for just a very few moments this afternoon to discuss another subject, a matter that is not pending at this moment, but in which I am sure the country is deeply interested.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that the naval appropriation bill is now before the Senate? If not, I think the Senator should allow it to be placed before the Senate before beginning his discussion on some other subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. New in the chair). The naval appropriation bill is before the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood that it was temporarily laid aside and had not yet been taken up.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I can not permit this Congress to end without drawing to the attention of the Senate again the activities of the special committee of the Senate, of which I am chairman, which spent a great deal of time last summer and fall inquiring into the coal situation throughout the country, resulting in the introduction of the Federal coal bill. I have carefully watched the attitude of men toward the supply and distribution of some of the basic necessities of the people and have become convinced that the time has come when, in the interest of the public, the Government must have some oversight of this basic necessity. Senators may argue that during the war this supervision tended to increase prices and destroy initiative, and undoubtedly this, in some degree, may have been the case, but the war taught us, too, that a method must be found of furnishing the people with the necessities of life at a reasonable price.

We have been drifting for many years toward a condition of things where the important industries of the land were being more closely controlled by a smaller group of men, and coupled with this we have to-day in many lines a very highly organized state of labor. Combinations of capital are necessary and are to be encouraged where these combinations serve the public good, where they bring to the people their everyday needs, where they tend to decrease cost and waste, but they are menacing not only to the individual business interests of the people but to the very foundation of our Government if they are permitted to continue uncontrolled, for their own selfish advantage. We recognize the right of the workers to organize for their good and engage in collective bargaining under fair and equitable conditions, but I am as strongly opposed to giving labor the right to organize against the public interest as I am opposed to permitting capital to do the same thing.

So, in the days ahead, those of us who are charged with authority, both in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, must see to it that the interests of the whole country are safeguarded. These are matters of great concern, as important as the settlement of our foreign relations and the modification of our tax laws. The country is drifting along in its oversight of business and labor into a very dangerous field, and unless we have the vision to protect the public welfare and see to it that the interests of both business and labor are directed in proper channels, who can tell but what the activities of one group or another may bring disastrous consequences?

The countries of Europe are struggling with these problems to-day, and we should take heed before we become entangled in the same difficulties. I have argued long and earnestly in an effort to convince the Senate of the need of enacting legislation which would tend to direct capital toward the financing of homes, that we might not ultimately become involved to the extent of having the Government go into the business of building homes for the people, but I have apparently talked to deaf ears, for not more than half a dozen Members of either House seem to realize that this is a fundamental question we will have to grapple with in a serious way sooner or later.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York does not object, I am constrained to ask for a quorum, be-

cause I think the observations that the Senator is making ought to be heard by more Senators than are now in the Chamber.

I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hedin	Nelson	Smoot
Ball	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sterling
Borah	Kellogg	Page	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kendrick	Phipps	Swanson
Calder	Kenyon	Pittman	Thomas
Capper	Keyes	Polndexter	Townsend
Culberson	King	Pomerene	Trammell
Cummins	Kirby	Ransdell	Underwood
Curtis	La Follette	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dial	Lenroot	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Lodge	Shields	Warren
Fernald	McCumber	Simmons	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Willis
Gerry	McLean	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Gooding	Moses	Smith, Md.	
Hale	Myers	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, many Senators insist that we should adopt a policy of leaving well enough alone, and that the situation will take care of itself, through a gradual return to normal times. This same argument was made in Europe by those opposed to the Government's affording facilities for private initiative, until the public clamor for relief so overwhelmed the governments that they were forced to go into the housing business themselves. The same reasoning was put forward in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia; little or no construction was undertaken, and the inadequate housing facilities, coupled with some instances of profiteering, raised rents to an abnormal level, until public opinion decreed the enactment of drastic rent laws which discouraged building. In my judgment the time is not far distant when Congress will be compelled to do one thing or the other; either to furnish facilities for the encouragement of private building or go into the business itself. The furnishing of shelter for the people where they can live comfortably and healthfully is one of the things that can not and must not be lightly treated, and we are treading on dangerous ground when we ignore this subject.

But, Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate to-day particularly on the subject of coal. The special committee of which I am chairman went thoroughly into this whole question, and it has been also carefully inquired into by the Committee on Manufactures, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is chairman. There is evidence before both of these committees which convinces me that in the interest of the American people we should legislate on the subject of the Nation's production and distribution of coal. It used to be said that there were three basic necessities of man: (1) Food, (2) shelter, and (3) clothing, but modern civilization has added to these fuel and transportation, so that to-day there are five which in my opinion may be named in the order of their relative importance, as follows: (1) Food, (2) fuel, (3) transportation, (4) shelter, and (5) clothing. Food, of course, is of the most immediate importance. Fuel is almost as basic as food. It creates the power that operates the railroads and the industries of the land; it furnishes light and the heat that cooks the food, and keeps us warm in winter; it can very properly be considered in the same relation to our everyday life as water, light, and heat. It took many years to convince the people of America that water, which falls from the heavens and comes from the ground, was charged with public use and necessity, but in the States and municipalities all over the country we have come to consider water, electricity, and gas as indispensable of life. In every city in the land the distribution of water is directly controlled by the governmental authorities, while electricity, gas, and the street railways are regulated down to the minutest detail. The question we must consider here is whether the time has now arrived when coal, which is used in the production of virtually everything we require, has become so necessary that it is charged with public use and necessity, and its production and distribution should be regulated by the Government. I am convinced that this is so, and that there is every obligation upon Congress to enact legislation to that end.

The evils encountered during the year 1920 were speculative conditions as the result of shortage of supply, artificial demand, and misuse of transportation facilities. The shortage sprang from strikes of miners in the winter of 1919. In the expectation

that prices would be lower, some of the large consumers of coal stayed out of the contract market in April, 1920, when there was every indication that prices would gradually descend after the cold weather had passed and the depleted stocks had been replenished, but the outlaw switchmen's strike stopped the movement of coal for a period of about two or three weeks, and transportation did not fully reach normal again until the wage award of the Railway Labor Board in July. The normal capacity of the mines recovered but gradually from April to July. The "vacations" of the anthracite miners served to aggravate the conditions by increasing the demand for bituminous coal in the East, and the exceptional demand for foreign export of coal, caused by the strikes of the British miners and the failure of Germany to deliver coal to France, brought about congestion at docks and at tidewater and threw our coastwise shipping into idleness, at the same time congesting the railroads and raising the price of spot coal in the area of acute shortage in the Eastern States.

When May 1, 1920, arrived the release of restrictions on export coal and the prices of domestic coal, and with predictions of impending shortage emanating from the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Railroad Administration, the Geological Survey, and Senator FRELINGHUYSEN's committee, the price of coal went up. Buyers of the automobile industry and other prosperous industries went into the coal fields with instructions to buy regardless of price. Industries which had made contracts for coal found that their contracts were not being fulfilled, and they were also forced into the spot market. This was particularly true of public utilities in New York and New England.

The Interstate Commerce Commission attempted to handle the situation through the control of transportation facilities, and while issuing ex parte priority orders they were delinquent in increasing the charge for the reconsignment of cars and also in advancing demurrage charges. Although the railroads were unduly congested through the forcing of coal over the rails instead of coastwise by vessel, the Interstate Commerce Commission took no effective action to bring the water transportation into use in the emergency, nor did it make proper provision for policing of its priority orders in order to prevent their abuse.

Strong opposition to the ex parte orders of the commission was voiced by industries cut off from transportation, and criticism was also directed at the delinquency of the commission in not curtailing the reconsignment privileges, increasing demurrage charges in order to discourage the holding of cars for speculative purposes, and also in failing to provide adequate policing of their priority orders.

It was contended that many industries in the eastern part of the country were brought to a standstill through lack of transportation facilities.

The gross volume of transportation, however, increased, while coal transportation became a matter of speculative profit. Car numbers were bought and sold, priority orders were bought and sold, and coal cars were held at terminals until the railroad terminals were blocked to other traffic and to legitimate coal business as well. The speculative element secured possession of a large tonnage of coal, moving it into terminals, and holding it there under demurrage for reconsignment; shipments changing hands from one speculator to another without the coal being unloaded.

The public utilities paid enormous sums of money for coal in order to keep running, sometimes bidding outrageous prices for coal held in terminals, in order to relieve conditions existing, and permitting other coal to come in. Coal shipments moved in circles around the terminals in New Jersey, or were reconsigned to distant points, possibly several times. Those conditions tied up railroad equipment, the rail and terminal facilities, and created shortages and artificial demands. Prices soared to an outrageous extent, especially at tidewater points, where the influence of export demand was felt.

A review of the year shows that no coal shortage actually existed; that the country produced 556,563,000 tons of bituminous coal during the year 1920, compared with 458,063,000 tons of bituminous coal during the year 1919; and that in spite of the strikes and priority orders, which always decrease the tonnage movement of railroads, they carried more tonnage in the year 1920 than in any previous year. The railroads averaged to move 191,000 cars of bituminous coal weekly in the year 1920, as compared with 154,000 cars weekly in the year 1919; so that there was no actual transportation or coal shortage.

The misuse of the transportation facilities by the coal industry to whom priorities were given at the expense of the general industry of the country and the domestic consumers of

coal was unfortunate, the abuse even extending to the abrogation of contracts.

The experiences of the War Department in the purchase of coal are well worthy of note. In the fiscal year from July 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, this department purchased 1,816,000 tons, at an average cost of \$3.22 per ton free on board at the mines. Eighty per cent of this was contract coal, bought at a price of \$2.85. The remainder was bought on the open market, due to failure of contractors to make delivery during the period of the bituminous strike in 1919, thus bringing up the average price of the whole to \$3.22.

For the year beginning July 1, 1920, the War Department had great difficulty in getting coal. Proposals asking for bids for 1,000,000 tons were opened on July 15, but the bids covered only 7,500 tons. Subsequently the War Department purchased on the open market 765,000 tons at an average price of \$7.12 per ton free on board at the mines.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I was unfortunately out of the Chamber and heard only the last part of the Senator's address. I am wondering whether he touched upon the reasons for the present price of anthracite coal in Washington—in the neighborhood of \$15.90 a ton for stove coal—as compared to the prices for the same class of coal in New York, and in that vicinity, of in the neighborhood of \$13 a ton. Has the Senator discussed that particular situation?

Mr. CALDER. No; Mr. President, I did not intend to go into the anthracite coal question except in a general way, because I am only making a summary of some of the things brought out in the coal inquiry. But I shall refer in my remarks later on to the fact that anthracite coal is very closely held in the eastern territory. Bituminous coal, as the Senator knows, is mined by a great number of operators, 2,500 or 3,000 miners, perhaps more than that, while 80 per cent of the anthracite is controlled by seven companies, as the Senator knows. It is a fact that the people in Washington are paying \$15 a ton for anthracite. In New York to-day the average price, I believe, is \$13.75. I had a letter from home yesterday about it.

Mr. EDGE. It is quite gratifying to know that in certain parts of northern New Jersey the price of anthracite has gone to \$12.50.

Mr. CALDER. I am very glad that there has been some reduction in anthracite. I think perhaps it is partly due to the activities of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], who has labored long and zealously to bring about some relief to the people of his State and the country in this matter of anthracite coal.

Mr. EDGE. I appreciate the kindly remarks of the Senator from New York; but I want to join with him and see if it is not possible to get some relief for the citizens of the District of Columbia. It seems to me the Capital City is poorly treated, if not worse than any other section of the country, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Mr. CALDER. I will add to what the Senator has said that the committee of which I am the chairman, and of which the Senator from New Jersey is a member, began an inquiry into the Washington situation, but when the Committee on Manufactures, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is chairman, took up the coal question we felt that the matter was more properly within his committee's province.

Perhaps the Senator's attention has not been called to the voluminous amount of testimony before Senator LA FOLLETTE's committee, which dealt with this Washington situation. It was very clearly demonstrated that there was a combination of interests here which sought to prevent anyone but the members of the Washington Retail Coal Association from entering the coal business. Men were unable to buy coal from dealers outside of the city because they were not members of the coal organization of this city. I am told that the matter is being investigated by the Department of Justice, and I trust something will be done to break up what appears to be a very close combination which is very detrimental to the consumers of coal in the District.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to say that not only the State of New Jersey, but the city of Washington, has fared during the past winter much better than the coal consumers in the State from which I come. In my town early in the winter, during the holidays, I purchased some anthracite coal myself, and paid \$18 a ton for it.

Mr. CALDER. I am glad to have the Senator from North Carolina bear witness to the profiteering on anthracite coal.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I may interrupt the Senator from New York for just a moment, in the course of the hearings before the Committee on Manufactures, it was developed that in the city of Washington the larger retail dealers have an association, and from the testimony taken by the Committee on Manufactures it would appear that they made war upon any independent dealer who sold below the association prices, or anyone who attempted to establish a coal business outside of the association. Considerable testimony was taken upon this subject, and witnesses appeared before the committee who testified that they had been compelled to retire from the retail business because of the difficulties which they encountered at the hands of this association in procuring coal and in conducting their business in competition with the members of the association. As a result of the testimony taken by the Committee on Manufactures, the Government has instituted an inquiry, which, if it is prosecuted, I believe will afford some relief to the people of Washington, and I hope, perhaps, at an early date.

With regard to prices of anthracite coal, it was testified before the committee that anthracite coal has been selling during the fall and winter at from \$16 to \$22 per ton in many sections of the country. Bituminous coal has also sold at the enormous rates of \$12 and \$15 a ton.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], after the hearings had been held by the committee of which he is chairman, came to the Committee on Manufactures on the 12th day of January.

Hearings were begun upon that bill immediately. We endeavored to expedite the hearings in the hope that we might report a bill that would be comprehensive, and afford some relief from the situation, but the hearings were extended; the subject is a vast one, and we were unable to close the hearings until the 15th of February, although we were in session every day, which brought us down to within a week or 10 days of the close of the session. Then the bill as amended was reported out and is now upon the calendar. It contains the fact-finding features of the bill as introduced by the Senator from New York. It was presented to the Senate with the emergency features eliminated in the hope it would be possible in that mild form to pass the bill. I have not been able to get the consent of those who were opposed to it to give unanimous consent for its consideration—a minority of the committee—nor have I been able to secure any arrangement by which it could be given time for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. CALDER. I thank the Senator for the interruption.

I had referred to coal purchased by the War Department. This coal was purchased through a number of companies acting as buying agents, one of which was the Wentz Co., which will be referred to later. This is the company whose president is D. B. Wentz, president of the National Coal Association. Practically all of the 62,638 tons which it purchased for the War Department have been traced by the committee back to the original producer. The situation is summarized in a small table which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Number of cars purchased.

Purchased by—		
Wentz Co. from producer direct.....	185	
Wentz Co., with 1 additional broker.....	411	
Wentz Co., with 2 additional brokers.....	155	
Wentz Co., with 3 additional brokers.....	13	
Wentz Co., with 4 additional brokers.....	4	
Total through additional brokers.....	583	
Grand total.....	768	

Margins.

Margin group.	Number of cars.	Additional brokers.	Margin per ton.
\$5 and over.....	12	W. H. Bradford & Co. (Inc.).....	\$5.40
\$4 to \$5.....	9	do.....	4.90
	2	Operators' Coal Mining Co.....	4.60
	1	United Fuel & Iron Co.....	4.25
	12		14.77
\$3 to \$4.....	1	Bader Coal Co.....	3.81
	2	United Fuel & Iron Co.....	3.50
	3		13.61

¹ Average margins weighted by number of cars.

Margins—Continued.

Margin group.	Number of cars.	Additional brokers.	Margin per ton.
\$2 to \$3.....	1	C. H. Lantz Coal Co.....	\$2.00
\$1 to \$2.....	7	United Fuel & Iron Co.....	1.75
	4	West Penn Fuel Co.....	1.50
	1	Operators' Coal Mining Co.....	1.50
	4	W. D. Hughes & Co.....	1.25
	2	McCarthy & Gilmore.....	1.02
	2	do.....	1.00
	4	Operators' Coal Mining Co.....	1.00
	2	George E. Warren.....	1.00
	2	United Fuel & Iron Co.....	1.00
	28		11.31
\$0.50 to \$1.....	244		1.59
\$0.25 to \$0.50.....	357		1.27
\$0.00 to \$0.25.....	114		1.11
Loss.....	5		.12

¹ Average margins weighted by number of cars.

Mr. CALDER. This table shows the size of margins, by groups, from \$5 per ton down, taken by brokers on this coal. The table is not arranged to show the total combined brokerage charges on the cars in any group. For instance, the margin of \$1.50 shown in the table as taken by the West Penn Fuel Co. was on the same cars on which McCarthy & Gilmore are shown as taking a margin of \$1.02, and there were also on these same cars charges of two other brokers, one of which is included in the table in the 50-cent to \$1 group and the other in the 25-cent to 50-cent group. Thus the table shows charges on particular transactions, but not pyramided charges.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CALDER. With pleasure.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from New York is discussing a measure in which I am very deeply interested and in which my constituents are very much interested. There is no part of the country that has suffered so much from inability to obtain coal or from excessive prices for both anthracite and bituminous coal as New England. I think there is a very strong sentiment in the State of Massachusetts in favor of the Government undertaking to do something to regulate in some manner the production and distribution of coal so that our manufacturing plants and the consuming public may be able to get coal expeditiously and at reasonable prices. Private management of this most vital commodity has evidently broken down. In fact, the Legislature of Massachusetts, a very conservative body, recently passed a joint resolution which I had entered in the Record, urging some governmental action by the Congress in the matter of coal. I read from the resolution—for it is indicative of the sentiment of the people of New England:

Ordered, That the General Court of Massachusetts is in favor of the creation or designation of some agency of the Federal Government with full power to ascertain facts and disseminate information and to regulate and control the production, sorting, grading, transportation, and distribution of coal to the several States to secure so far as possible a sufficient supply of coal of good quality at reasonable prices to the consumers in the several States.

Mr. President, the sentiment of the American people is, generally speaking, overwhelmingly against governmental interference in private business. I mean strictly private business in distinction from certain businesses that are charged with a public use. I am strongly opposed to the Government interfering in private business in any manner or form. However, where two conditions or factors exist in private business, a form of Government inspection, regulation, or possibly Government control may become imperative and necessitate an exception to the general rule of noninterference.

First, is the business which it is suggested should be regulated or controlled in some form or manner by the Government producing a commodity or product which is a public necessity? Is it something essential and indispensable to the life, to the happiness, to the prosperity, to the well-being of the American people? I suppose we will agree that coal is; I do not see how anyone can successfully dispute that fact.

The second factor is this—and this is important—it is why I am addressing an inquiry to the Senator from New York:

Is the article or the product made or produced through a business organization that has become a monopoly? Has the element of competition been removed as a factor in the regulating of prices? In other words, has the coal industry reached

a stage in modern development where it is a monopoly? If it has my duty as a public servant is easily determined.

If a product that is vitally essential to the happiness and prosperity of the American people is being made or produced by a group of men who can control and regulate the price of it, limit the production of it, or remove the element of competition in fixing the prices to the consumer, then I do not hesitate to say that such a private business is a subject for governmental inquiry, concern, and possible regulation. I wish to have it clearly understood that no one is more opposed to the Government interfering with private business than I am, but I am not going to be frightened because of my belief in this principle from protecting the welfare of the American people and from using the functions of our people's Government to regulate a monopoly, a private business in the hands of a few who can control prices, who can profiteer without restraint upon the American public. When such factors as I have described exist in an industry I shall not hesitate to urge legislation to prevent the American people from being exploited.

All this is preliminary, and I assume from the Senator's position on this subject that the Senator agrees with these fundamental principles that I have briefly and imperfectly attempted—

Mr. CALDER. I am in complete accord with the statement that the Senator has made.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We all agree that the coal business is one which is essential to the business development of our country. I can not overemphasize how important it is to the future development of our general industries to have coal flow steadily and constantly and at reasonable prices from the coal fields of the country to the consumers.

I do not mind saying that I have been very much distressed about the industrial future of New England because of the steadily increasing price of coal and difficulties of obtaining sufficient supply. Coal is so essential to our New England industrial life that without it there can be no steady business development unless electricity or some other motive power is made a substitute. We have no undeveloped water power to speak of in New England, and of course to develop electricity coal is necessary. Unquestionably the serious danger to our future growth and prosperity caused by the high cost of coal led the Legislature of Massachusetts to adopt the resolution to which I have referred. The people there are very deeply concerned about the coal situation, about their inability to get the needed supply, and about the exorbitant prices they are forced to pay. If it had not been for the Almighty giving us the mild winter climate that we have enjoyed—

Mr. CALDER. And the closing down of many industries.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; and the closing down of many industries we would have had as great suffering in New England during the past winter as has occurred in any part of the country during our lifetime. Fortunately those two elements have tended to relieve the situation from assuming alarming proportions.

In brief, what I desire to ask the Senator is whether bituminous or anthracite coal has become a monopoly. Is it a product that is in the hands of a limited few who can at will curtail the production, advance prices, hold the public at their mercy, and profiteer without limit if they so desire. I ask this question both as to bituminous and anthracite coal. If the Senator is able to convince me that a monopoly exists, I for one will support some remedial legislation or will support not necessarily the Senator's exact bill, but a measure intended to restore the factor of competition in some form or other and seek, if possible, to increase and improve the production, quality, and transportation of this very essential commodity.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. CALDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KENYON. Has he any doubt in his own mind about anthracite? There may be some doubt about bituminous coal, but certainly there is none about anthracite.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The committee of which I am a member has not discussed at such length the anthracite situation as bituminous, but I will say to the Senator frankly that I have not any doubt that anthracite is to-day in the hands of a few owners, who not only control the production but the transportation as well.

Mr. KENYON. Less than a dozen owners.

Mr. CALDER. Seven.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to correct the statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts with regard to the evidence taken by the Committee on Manufactures. I think it was taken

in part during his absence, but certainly the record will show very conclusively that the anthracite industry is completely controlled. If it has not reached the stage which would enable one to characterize it as a monopoly, then I am at a loss to know what facts would warrant one in arriving at that conclusion.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I spoke with caution, having, however, steadily approached the same conviction as the Senator from Iowa, namely, that this business is unquestionably a monopoly.

Mr. KENYON. How many concerns, I would like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin, are shown by the testimony to control or practically control all the anthracite of the United States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There are seven great coal companies affiliated with seven great railroad companies that control 80 per cent of the anthracite of the country.

Mr. KENYON. What area of territory does that cover, if I may ask the Senator?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The entire anthracite fields are in the State of Pennsylvania. There are three of those fields. If they were brought together into one solid piece of territory, it would constitute a patch of country 8 miles wide by 60 miles long. That is all the anthracite we have in the United States. We have some high-grade bituminous coals in different States that are called semianthracite, but I think they are regarded by the experts as high-grade bituminous coal, and the area of those deposits is quite limited.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I repeat, I have not much doubt about the situation, so far as anthracite coal is concerned. Of course, we know what answer the coal people make to that. It is very interesting; I never heard it before. The answer as to anthracite coal is that it is a luxury and that the Government should not attempt to regulate a luxury. They say it is not a necessity any longer.

Mr. KENYON. At present prices is it not a luxury?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the Senator from Iowa will agree that it should not be, but it has been made so by present prices.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a curiosity.

Mr. KENYON. It is a curiosity at present prices.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Now, coming to the question of bituminous coal, has the bituminous-coal business reached the stage where it has become a monopoly? I find a very great misunderstanding about the bituminous-coal situation. If we take the whole country at large, the answer is that it has not become a monopoly, but certain sections of the bituminous output can, in fact, become a monopoly. For instance, New England gets its bituminous coal alone from the Pennsylvania and West Virginia fields. So far as New England is concerned, there might be bituminous coal in every other section of the country and it be practically of no serviceable value to New England. I suppose the great Northwest depends upon the output of bituminous coal in Ohio, Indiana—

Mr. CALDER. And in Illinois, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes; the Northwest depends on Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and other States. What I am concerned about is whether the Senator from New York has any figures or information tending to show that in the various bituminous coal fields there has been or is a combination among the producers controlling prices, controlling output, which amounts to a monopoly? I think that is a very important and a very essential fact to develop, so that we may be able to ascertain whether the bituminous-coal business has reached the stage of a monopoly.

Now, the very first answer one hears is that bituminous coal comes from independent operators in Colorado, Illinois, West Virginia, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania; but it seems to me it is important to know whether in a given field control has fallen into the hands of a few operators and the prices thereby regulated and controlled for the consumers dependent on them.

If the Senator from New York can give us any information as to what extent the coal fields where bituminous coal is mined have gone into the hands and possession of a few producers, I should like very much to have it.

Let me say while I am on my feet that I find this suggestion very frequently made—I find it in my letters from New England—that nothing should be done to attempt to regulate the coal industry, because if we do it will be an entering wedge; it will be the beginning of governmental interference with private business; it will be the beginning of interference with the boot

and shoe and other New England industries, which are so essential and important to New England.

Mr. CALDER. And with picture frames and carpets and other articles.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Let me say here that the boot and shoe industry is not a monopoly and it never has been a monopoly. The reason why the industry has grown and developed as it has is because of the large number of private individuals and small corporations engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes. It will be interesting to know that when recently discussing this matter with a manufacturer of boots and shoes I took occasion to say to him, "I do not know of any industry which, if it should become a monopoly, would be regulated more quickly by the Government than the boot and shoe industry." The manufacturer quickly replied, "When the boot and shoe industry becomes a monopoly, it ought to be the first industry to be regulated."

I want to ask the pardon of the Senator from New York for taking up so much time and for interrupting his able and interesting speech. I should like him, in addition to any evidence that has been presented to the committee, of which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is chairman, to state to what extent the bituminous coal industry in this country has become a monopoly.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his interruption and for his illuminating statement. I know that New England has had, perhaps, a more difficult time during the past year in connection with the supply of coal than has any other part of the country. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa that it is unquestionably a fact that the anthracite coal industry, closely held as it is—80 per cent, as the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, being held by seven companies—is very nearly a monopoly.

The bituminous coal situation is somewhat different. There are mines of bituminous coal all over the country. I am not prepared to say on this floor that the bituminous coal industry is so held that it can be claimed to be a monopoly, but I do insist that to everyone who observed closely the conditions of the coal business last summer and fall it would seem that the bituminous coal business was so held that it was possible to raise and lower prices at will.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that just as soon as business is again active, just as soon as industry becomes normal, there will be the same condition in the bituminous coal industry as existed last summer and fall, when people were compelled to pay two and three times a reasonable price for bituminous coal.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. KING. My information is not very accurate, and I have not studied the question as has the Senator from New York, but may we not attribute the extortionate prices of coal to what might be denominated combinations of middlemen and brokers rather than to any concerted action on the part of the producers? My understanding is that brokers and middlemen would take, if not the entire output of a mine, substantially all of the output of a mine, and when they secured control of the product and it passed beyond the control of the mine they then raised the price levels until the people were charged excessive and extortionate prices.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, that is undoubtedly true to a very great extent. The evidence before the committee of the Senator from Wisconsin indicates that in certain coal fields of the country, particularly in Pennsylvania, Maryland, the Virginias, Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, there was a very abnormal profit made during one-half of last year; in fact, most of the operators in those States profited to the extent of 100 per cent upon the cost of their production, while in the States farther west the mine profits were not much more than normal. Somehow or other here in the East, perhaps because of the great demand for export and because of the unusual demand upon the part of the industries, there seemed to be a getting together—I have not developed that sufficiently to prove there was an actual combination of interests—but there was undoubtedly an understanding which certainly had the effect of raising the price of bituminous coal to the consumer.

In addition to what I have said, there is no doubt that middlemen profited abnormally. I was discussing when the Senator from Massachusetts interrupted me the purchases by the War Department when they were unable to buy their coal under contract last summer and fall. The facts disclosed

seemed to indicate that while prices back at the mine were high, they were not high in comparison with those which the Government paid. For the coal which at the mines in some cases sold for \$4 a ton the Government paid as high as \$10 or \$11.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another suggestion?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, he will recall that the investigations which his committee has been conducting developed the fact that prior to the war for many years the price of bituminous coal at the mines was from 87 cents to \$1.10, which was cheaper than the coal at the mine in Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, and in many parts of England. It seemed to be absolutely impossible for any monopoly of bituminous coal to exist before the war. If there was any monopoly, it was a monopoly instituted after the coal had passed from the hands of the producer into the hands of the middlemen.

I merely challenge attention to that fact to show that if there was no monopoly then there ought not to be any monopoly now in the bituminous fields; but, unfortunately, during the war and following the war people seemed to have acted upon the assumption that the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law had been suspended, and there is no doubt in the world but what, in the teeth of State statutes and of Federal laws, monopolies have developed and have practiced their nefarious operations to the injury of the American people.

I hope that as we return to normal conditions we will enforce our State statutes against monopolies and also the Federal statutes and strengthen the Sherman antitrust law, because if we do not destroy monopolies either by penal statutes or by the power of taxation—and we can reach any monopoly by the power of taxation—there will be an irresistible demand grow upon the part of the American people for the control of all business which is susceptible of monopoly; and I think, confronted with that alternative, that we should strengthen the Sherman antitrust law; that we should punish monopolists; that we should not ignore a monopoly simply because some court may say that it is a reasonable monopoly; but we ought to proceed upon the theory that monopolies are bad ab initio and enact statutes to punish monopolies in a penal way or tax them in a progressive manner, so that they would be forced to a dissolution. I ask the Senator to pardon the length of the interruption.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to trespass upon the Senator's time nor wear out his patience—

Mr. CALDER. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But if I may make an observation, partly in response to the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], whom I do not now see in the Chamber, and partly in response to what the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has just said. There is no question, as I suppose every Senator well knows, that the supply of bituminous coal in the United States is, practically speaking, inexhaustible. We have bituminous-coal fields that will supply the people of this country for centuries to come. However, that must not be understood to mean that a condition may not arise within a reasonable time, when we will begin to feel the pinch of high-cost production that will be burdensome even though there were no possibility of the element of control.

Bituminous coal is being mined very wastefully. Beyond any question, we are destroying beyond possibility of recovery 40 per cent of the deposits under the system of mining as it is now conducted. It behooves this Government and the people of this country to consider whether or not in the public interest a degree of regulation may not be interposed in this industry, as it has been interposed by the Governments of other countries, to prevent that waste even with the operation of the mines in the hands or under the control of private interests.

Now, just one word about the monopoly element which may enter into our consideration of the bituminous-coal question.

Of course, as to quantity it can not be said, with its wide distribution, that as it lies in the ground it can be easily subjected to a monopoly control; but we have taken testimony that will make three printed volumes. The inquiry was directed for the most part into the bituminous coal situation. I do not know how other members of the committee were impressed, but I am convinced that there exists between the mouth of the mine—and I am choosing my words now with care—and the consumer of bituminous coal a control of price and delivery that in effect imposes almost if not as great a burden upon the consuming public as could be imposed if the deposits of bituminous coal in

the ground were more limited, and it could be cornered there. I believe a more complete investigation of this subject will disclose that in the mining and marketing of coal there is at every stage a degree of cooperation which amounts to at least partial control which is reflected in the exorbitant prices that the consumer has had to pay for coal.

I wanted to make that brief statement, and, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that I realize that it is very doubtful that legislation upon this subject can be passed at this session. It was doubtful when we received the bill if it would be possible to secure legislation if a thorough investigation was made and we sought to get comprehensive legislation; but I believe that the bill which was reported by the committee might have been passed if the condition of business in the Senate had permitted taking it up at that time. If it is not passed, however, I am hopeful that there will be a further consideration of this vitally important subject.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] inquired a moment ago as to the profit of the jobber or middleman. That is very well illustrated in the purchases by the War Department of coal during the summer and fall of 1920. I was illustrating, before I was interrupted, just how that operated.

Col. Wentz, the president of the National Coal Association, sold coal to the War Department in September and October at prices ranging from \$9 to \$10.75. He testified before the committee of which I am chairman that he was president of the Stonega Coke & Coal Co. of Virginia, an operating concern, and that its own output had been sold for the entire summer at a price of \$3.83 a ton.

Now, while Col. Wentz was selling his own coal, mined at his own mine, for \$3.83 a ton in July, 1920, and on which he agreed he had a margin of profit of \$1.33 a ton, which was about 35 per cent upon the cost of the product, during that same month, in fact, on July 14, his jobbing company, the Wentz Co., was quoting prices of \$13 to \$13.75 on the general market. That shows very clearly what the margins of the middleman or the several middlemen were, for much of the coal passed through from three to five hands.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if this coal was delivered at the same place? Was it f. o. b. mine?

Mr. CALDER. It was the mine price, always. Here the Wentz Co. is stating that the ruling market price in July is \$13 to \$13.75 at the mines—on whose coal is not stated; what the exact cost was is not known, but that is what they were getting for it. Somebody else's coal, not Wentz's, cost the War Department \$13 to \$13.75.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, is the Senator referring to anthracite or bituminous?

Mr. CALDER. Bituminous coal. As I indicated, for the coal mined in Col. Wentz's own mine he got \$3.83, and he stated that the profit was \$1.33. At the same time, acting as an agent or as a wholesale coal dealer, he was selling coal in July for \$13.75. In the same month Mr. Wentz's own mine was selling, as I said, at \$3.83.

Margins before the war used to be 10 to 20 cents a ton, not over 20 cents. They should, no doubt, be somewhat higher now; but Mr. Wentz has not complained that the Stonega Co.'s margin was not high enough—it ranged from 19 cents in January to \$1.33 in July, and averaged 77 cents for January to September. Yet the Stonega's average price in July was nearly \$10 a ton less than the prices that the Wentz Co. was quoting on July 14.

Obviously, after making all possible allowances for greater costs of other fields or other companies, there can be no explanation of cost that will account for this \$10 difference in price. It is indefensible.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Did not the Senator find that a good part of that increase was due to the fact that these brokers were selling from one to another and each time adding a very substantial profit?

Mr. CALDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. POMERENE. I will not say a reasonable profit, but in many cases a very unreasonable profit.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, our committee, through its experts and through correspondence, traced practically every ton of coal purchased from Col. Wentz back to the mines, and we found that the coal came from central Pennsylvania, in the main. The costs at the mine in that region, we found, were about \$3.10 a ton for the period April to September, 1920,

because we were able to obtain, when we subpoenaed the papers of the National Coal Association, a great many records that they had in their possession.

They had gone to the courts and prevented the Government from getting information upon production and costs of mining, but they had in their possession certain records which we took; and after we examined them carefully we were able to go back to the mines and ascertain the actual cost during last year. Now, this coal that Col. Wentz sold all came from central Pennsylvania, and we were able to trace back, as I say, nearly every ton of it to the very people from whom it was bought first. It was sold in the beginning for \$4.50, say; the next man made 60 cents, the next one \$3, the next one \$1.50, the next one 40 cents, until finally it got to the War Department at from \$9 to \$10.75 a ton, passing through four or five hands, all making a profit, or sometimes the producers' price was \$7 or \$8 and the brokers did not make so much.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, is this the same Col. Wentz who charged the Government a commission of 50 cents a ton to sell it?

Mr. CALDER. Yes, sir.

Mr. POMERENE. He had been in the coal business; and certainly, if he was to have any due regard for the Government, he would have known enough to go to the operators and buy at the mouth of the mine, instead of through a number of these brokers.

Mr. CALDER. Of course there is no better-informed man in the country on bituminous coal than this same Col. Wentz, because he is president of the National Coal Association of the United States, among whose members are practically all of the large bituminous coal operators in the country.

The most partisan representatives of the coal industry will have difficulty in answering the proposition that the public is entitled to full information regarding their industry. They maintain that they have nothing to conceal; they assert that the "open-price" information which they formerly obtained until dissuaded therefrom by court decision in other industries held such "open-price" information illegal—this information, they assert, was gathered with a view to the widest public dissemination in the hope that it would be carried on the financial pages of the daily newspapers of the country. While I never saw nor heard of the coal association's price data being published in newspapers, the representatives of the association have at least put themselves on record in the hearings that we have had that it was their object to give this information the widest publicity. They can not, then, object to publicity for it under this bill. The costs of operators in the association were earnestly sought by the association for the purpose, they have testified, of presenting the cost information to the committees of Congress. Therefore, it is clear that they do not object to publicity of the costs of their industry. What, then, do they object to in the program of information? Nothing, as I see it, except the fact that they, the interested parties, will not be the sole arbiters of what information is gathered and what information is given out, nor the manner in which it is compiled and the interpretation of its detail.

Will any Senator agree that it is proper that information on this industry vital to our national life shall be gathered or not gathered, given out or not given out, and interpreted solely by those who have coal to sell? I think that however good the intentions may be, interested parties given such power it is idle to suppose that the best and fairest results can come from such a policy. There is too much temptation in power like that, and it is too easy for those wielding it to let their own natural viewpoint affect the figures or color the interpretation that they will place upon the material that comes to their hand. In the record of the hearings before the Committee on Reconstruction and the Committee on Manufactures are instances that show what is likely to happen if the power of information is entirely in the hands of those whose interests are at stake. For example, in the files of the National Coal Association was found a small poster, used for propaganda purposes, which displayed in great detail the many items of cost entering into the production of coal. This large number of items was inclosed in a long bracket, opposite which on the poster appeared this statement in prominent type:

The cost of production is made up of these 200 or more items which the operator has to pay to put the ton of coal on railroad cars ready for shipment. The wage of the miner is just one item out of the many.

Mr. Morrow, vice president of the National Coal Association, on being questioned, admitted that the one item of labor constitutes 75 to 80 per cent of the total costs of producing coal. This fact, however, was not stated on the poster. That seems to be an illustration of misleading propaganda which is likely to result from publicity by interested channels.

We need accurate information vouched for by an unbiased Government agency, sworn to its duty, which includes just as much a proper regard for the rights of the coal operator as for the rights of the consumer. We particularly need this information accurately and dispassionately on production. That is the gauge against which demand measures itself. And we also particularly need accuracy and detachment in the information on the causes of idle time at the mines, for on this information the public tends to rely in apportioning the responsibility of the operators, or the railroads, or the mine laborers for falling off in production or the praise for an increase in the supply. Because the public judgment regarding labor and the operator, or regarding the operators and the railroads, is in the balance, we need to be especially careful to have this information free from even a suspicion of bias.

Mr. President, nothing more impressed me in the hearings on coal by the Special Committee on Reconstruction than the fact that in the face of the coal crisis that has distressed and outraged the country during the past year, the great organized power of the coal operators, through the leaders of the national association, has stubbornly maintained the position that the mining and distribution of coal is a "private" business.

The leadership of the association has used a large part of the great funds collected from the operators to influence by propaganda and to fight by lawsuits and injunctions any agency of Government that attempts to enforce the rights of the public to information or to adequate protection against profiteering.

Here in Washington the National Coal Association, which collects from its members annually in the neighborhood of \$400,000, spending a very large part of this for legal services and propaganda, has secured an injunction against the Federal Trade Commission in the Maynard case, preventing them from obtaining information concerning the production of coal, on the theory, among others, that the production of coal is an intrastate matter; while in Indiana the same association, joining with others, has secured an injunction against the Indiana Food and Fuel Commission preventing them from functioning, on the theory, among others, that the production of coal is an interstate matter.

There are many honest men in the coal business who are endeavoring to conduct their business in a way that will attract public favor, but others have taken advantage during the past year of conditions brought about partly by shortage of transportation, partly by our largely increased exports, and partly also by the panicky attitude of certain governmental departments here in Washington, altogether creating a situation whereby the people of America were mulcted of a sum estimated at from six hundred to fifteen hundred million dollars during the year 1920.

My coal bill is not designed to bring about Government operation of the coal mines. It is a simple coal regulation bill which requires everyone engaged in the coal business, both operator and dealer, to file with the Federal Trade Commission at regular intervals a statement of the business done by the corporation or individual, the amount of coal produced, to whom sold, and the margin of profit. It levies a tax upon the coal dealer who sells to another dealer. The purpose of this provision is to drive coal direct from the producer to the consumer. Public utilities and manufacturing plants buy their coal in the main directly from the operators, but the householder's coal usually passes through several hands before it reaches its final destination. The householder has no one to look after him, and, in my opinion, the tax on the wholesaler's profits would result in a reduction of the price to the consumer. The bill also provides that the President may take over the coal business whenever an emergency arises. Operators insist that this means in the end permanent governmental control, and others contend that in case of an emergency, brought about by a labor controversy, the Army will be used to move the coal. For my part, I am strongly in favor of the power being placed in the President's hands to protect the public interests in an emergency. I live in the city of New York, one of the great coal-consuming centers of the Nation, where 6,000,000 people reside within a limited area; and I doubt if at any time within the confines of that city there is a supply of coal for the industries, the public utilities, and the householders for a greater period than two weeks. An emergency might occur that would warrant the Government's putting its strong hand on this business so as to assure the very life of the people being protected. I am in favor of that being done, regardless of whether or not it interferes with the operator, the dealer, or the worker, and I am certain that the great mass of the people, if the question were submitted to them, would agree with me.

The Committee on Manufactures has reported a bill which deals only with one part of this question. I regret that it did not report this measure with some of the provisions the committee has eliminated, but I do not complain, for in their effort to secure legislation on the subject at this session they have, perhaps, pursued the best course. As reported by the committee, the bill provides that every man engaged in the coal business whose annual sales exceed \$50,000 shall file at regular intervals a report of the coal produced, the cost of producing, the amount obtained for it, and to whom the coal is sold.

The coal dealer is compelled to furnish the same information. This data is collected by the Federal Trade Commission, and the commission is required at regular intervals to advise the public as to the cost of producing coal in the various communities and other facts which, in my judgment, will tend largely to aid the people in securing coal at a fair price. If the commission has reason to believe that any operator or dealer is engaged in unfair practices it can make the facts known to the public by a majority vote of its members.

This legislation recommended by the Committee on Manufactures will be a step forward, and it may be the solution; and I hope the Senate, even at this late day, will see fit to pass it. No reasonable objection can be raised to it. The country ought to know the facts concerning the mining and distribution of the anthracite used in the larger cities of the East. Eighty per cent of this commodity is produced by seven companies which are directly connected with the railroad companies that enter into the coal fields of Pennsylvania. I submit, Mr. President, that the American people have a right to complete information concerning this basic commodity. Failure to legislate at least to this extent will bring down upon Congress the condemnation of the country; and if the men interested continue to fight this effort to obtain light on the subject, they will themselves bring a public demand which will lead to complete Government control.

The American people, Mr. President, are deeply concerned in this subject. They are waiting to hear what action Congress will take, and while I am not in the habit of warning Senators concerning their conduct here, I submit we are dealing with a question most momentous, and in our disposition of it we must have in mind, above all, the public good. Witnesses appearing before the committee of which I am chairman have testified that there are enough coal deposits in the country to last 5,000 years, notwithstanding that last year we made a record by mining over 620,000,000 tons. Europe will need more coal from us this year than before, and we will also require more for our own business needs. Some Senators argue that the price of bituminous coal is not excessive to-day, and that statement is true; but, Mr. President, this condition is brought about by the fact that one-half of our industries have shut down and the very mild winter has reduced the need of the householders of the country. With the extension of our foreign trade, however, the return of the business of America to normal, and with the continued shortage of railroad transportation, which is bound to last for several years, immediate action is required to prevent a recurrence in 1921 or 1922 of the conditions which we endured in 1920. We should get ready to forestall any such outrageous profiteering as existed last year.

I urge upon the Senate serious consideration of this subject. It will, in my opinion, go a long way toward furnishing relief.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVES BURNETT AND BLACKMON.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the Senate by order has set apart the hour of 3 o'clock for eulogies on two late Representatives from the State of Alabama, and as that hour has about arrived, if there is no objection, I will ask that the Senate proceed under that order.

I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read:

The reading clerk read the resolutions, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 25, 1921.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, late a Member of this House from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of the exercises of this day, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 20, 1921.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. FRED L. BLACKMON, late a Member of this House from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That as a particular mark of respect to the memory of the deceased and in recognition of his distinguished public career, the House, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I submit the following resolutions and ask for their adoption:

The resolutions (S. Res. 469) were read and considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended, that opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of the Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT and the Hon. FRED L. BLACKMON, late Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the families of the decedents.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, we stand in the closing hours of a dying Congress. The hour is fast approaching when friendships of many years' standing must part and go their separate ways. We can not but feel in our inner hearts a note of sadness as we realize the ties that bound many of us together are about to sever, and in this hour we halt the column in its march along the legislative highways to recall the memory of our friends and colleagues who served loyally with us in life and passed to the great beyond within the life of this Congress.

The State of Alabama asks you to halt the legislative battle for an hour to do reverence to the memory of two of our honored sons, JOHN LAWSON BURNETT, who was elected from the seventh district of Alabama to the Sixty-sixth Congress, but died before it convened, and FRED L. BLACKMON, of the fourth district of Alabama, who served until a few weeks ago, when he was called to his fathers.

JOHN LAWSON BURNETT was born at Cedar Bluff, Cherokee County, Ala., January 20, 1854. When he was only 4 years old he lost his father, and his widowed mother had three children to care for and the burden of life to face unaided. As soon as he was able to do so, Mr. BURNETT went to work to aid in the support of his mother and two brothers. He was not afraid of labor and worked in the coal mines and the fields of Alabama, studying at night to obtain the rudiments of his education. Finally he was able to attend the common schools of Cherokee County, and then amassed sufficient funds to carry him to the Wesleyan Institute in Georgia, where he received his early education. Finally, after hard work and study, he was able to enter the Vanderbilt University, graduated at the age of 22, and was admitted to the bar. If there ever was a truly self-made man, JOHN L. BURNETT was the man, striving as he did from his early youth through hardship and privation to attain ultimate success. He was an excellent and successful lawyer, obtaining prominence among the best in his native State. His sterling worth and high character were early recognized by his home people, and at the age of 30 he was elected to the house of representatives in the General Assembly of Alabama, and two years later was elected to the State senate, serving in both with distinction. Shortly afterwards he was named by the Democratic Party as their standard bearer and elected by his people as a Member of the Fifty-sixth Congress. He was re-elected for the 10 succeeding terms and served for 20 years before his untimely death. During his Membership in the House of Representatives he was recognized as a staunch and unyielding Democrat, ably sustaining the great principles of his party; but he was more than that: He was an American first, last, and all the time, always ready to serve and sacrifice for our common country rather than yield to the call of political expediency. He was a hard and faithful worker in Congress, a student of the principles of government, and he never undertook to espouse a cause without a thorough understanding of it.

We who knew JOHN BURNETT best loved him for his sturdy and rugged character, his honesty of purpose, and his faithful friendship. He has gone to the great beyond, but his memory will always be cherished by his colleagues.

Mr. President, the delegation from Alabama mourn the loss of another friend and colleague, who died but a few weeks ago. FRED L. BLACKMON was born in Lime Branch, Polk County, Ga., on the 15th day of September, 1873, and when he was 20 years of age he moved to Calhoun County, Ala., and made that his home to the day of his death. He served with distinction in the General Assembly of Alabama, and was elected to the Sixty-second Congress and served for nearly 10 years, up to the time of his death. He was a lawyer of excellent ability and high attainments; a representative of the people, in whom all had

confidence in his high integrity, honesty of purpose, unbending loyalty to the principles in which he believed, and devotion to his people unrivaled by any. He was a Democrat in political faith, not merely by the accident of birth or environment but because he had a full understanding of the fundamental principles of his party and unyielding faith in those great principles being the beacon star of our national life. He had the courage of his convictions. He never sacrificed principle for the sake of expediency. He was ready to sustain the cause he advocated regardless of the cost to himself. He was an excellent debater and earnest worker and loyal friend. But above all things he stood to the world four square as a real man, a staunch friend, and true American. Honesty of purpose and loyalty of character always marked his course in life. We who knew him best loved him most. His passing from us left a deep sorrow in our hearts and an abiding love of his memory that will rest with us always.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senate has scarcely known a busier time than that through which we are now passing. We pause in the midst of important duties to pay tribute to the memory of two departed friends. Both of them served with ability and distinction in the House of Representatives.

JOHN L. BURNETT, of Alabama, enjoyed the cordial friendship of all his associates. He was active, diligent, and capable in the performance of his duties as a Representative in Congress. It is seldom that anyone has enjoyed a more liberal experience than was the lot of Mr. BURNETT. Trained in hardships, he proved himself equal to every task which he assumed. He was never known to betray a friend or to neglect a duty. Mr. BURNETT's service extended over a period of many years. It was his privilege as well as his duty to deal with some of the gravest problems that have come to Congress during the last 25 years. I bear witness to the fact that he never failed to give careful study to the questions upon which it was his duty to reflect, and that he never feared to speak and vote as he was prompted to do by a sincere conviction of duty.

Another Representative from the same State recently has been called by death. The Senate honors itself in paying just and appropriate tributes to the names and services of JOHN L. BURNETT and FRED L. BLACKMON.

Mr. BLACKMON fell in the very prime of life. His personal characteristics endeared him to everyone with whom he came in contact. He was genial, sincere, loyal, and able. As a lawyer he earned distinction at the bar of Alabama. As a legislator his services were characterized by independence of thought and fearlessness of action. He belonged to the old school of statesmen who believe in the preservation of the respective powers of the States and of the Nation. He witnessed with regret the constant growth and multiplication of Federal agencies and the expansion of Federal activities. We are all conscious of the fact that Federal agencies during the last 20 years have multiplied in numbers and that Federal activities have been so greatly increased Congress is now almost constantly in session. Throughout the future it is probable that Congress will be in continuous performance.

Mr. BLACKMON enjoyed many intimate friends throughout the period of his service in the House of Representatives. He was interested in many important measures of legislation. As a speaker he was forceful, clear, and direct. He was always prompt and diligent in the performance of his duties. His people trusted him and repeatedly returned him to Congress. He rewarded their confidence with faithful devotion to their interests and with conscientious performance of duty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when I first came to the House of Representatives, some 10 years ago, one of the strong men of that body was JOHN L. BURNETT, to whose memory we pay tribute to-day. At that time he was chairman of the Immigration Committee of the House, and at that time the immigration question was probably one of the leading questions of the day. An immigration bill providing for restriction of immigration by a literacy test had been passed by both bodies during President Taft's administration, as I recall, and he had vetoed it. Under the leadership of Mr. BURNETT another bill of similar character and having a similar purpose was passed by both bodies in Wilson's administration, and vetoed by President Wilson. The Senate and House overrode the veto of President Wilson and the bill became the law. That fight was led by Mr. BURNETT in the House of Representatives in a masterly way.

He was a forceful speaker. Of the question of immigration he was a great student. He went to Europe and studied the question from that viewpoint as he studied it from every viewpoint here and when he spoke he spoke as a man of authority.

He was an authority upon that great question, and did much to solve it. It was he who first in an official way brought the dangers of unrestricted immigration straight home to the American people. The law on that subject that we have recently passed is quite largely an outgrowth of his earnest and steadfast work on that subject. His work in the House was of the most effective kind. His services to his State were of the same character. He was a diligent, faithful, intelligent, and efficient legislator.

Mr. President, Mr. BURNETT was a man of the deepest conviction of right, a man of the highest purposes, a man who was unafraid in the performance of every public and private duty. The word "fear" was not known to JOHN L. BURNETT. His life was an open book. He was kindly, genial, and pleasant, especially to the younger and newer Members of the House. He was friendly to all, esteemed and respected by all for his splendid worth, and for his many genial and lovable traits of character.

I know of no man who impressed himself on his fellow Members as a more genuine, a more sincere, a more honest, or a more upright man than JOHN L. BURNETT.

In every phase of life he took a man's part. A kindly, gentle, splendid man he was and I honor and respect his memory. I am glad that the Senate of the United States has paused long enough in this busy session to permit a tribute to be paid to his life and character.

Alabama has sustained a great loss in his death. His friends miss his kindly fellowship. The House has been deprived of an able and splendid Member.

Mr. President, Alabama has indeed been unfortunate lately in the loss of her distinguished sons. Mr. Burnett's death was followed by that of Congressman FRED L. BLACKMON, a Representative from the fourth Alabama district. His death was sudden and unexpected. He died while away from home.

Mr. President, I was born in the State of Alabama, in the district that was represented in the House of Representatives by Mr. BLACKMON for so many years. He lived near my home. He was educated by my eldest sister. I think the most of the education that he received was received at her hands. He was a splendid young boy. He was a good student. He had a splendid mind. When he arrived at manhood's estate, he became a lawyer, having received his legal education at the University of Alabama. He made a distinguished record there, and afterwards at the bar he quickly assumed a commanding position. He was successful in all that he attempted.

Turning to politics while still a young man, he was elected to the House of Representatives and was reelected five times, his period of service extending over 10 years. Popular in his own district, no one could defeat him. Though it was frequently tried, he always won by his ability, by his geniality, by his honesty and sincerity of purpose.

He did not always agree with probably most of his constituents; he frequently disagreed with them. I remember on the subject of prohibition his views did not accord with the majority views of his district, but in that manly, upright, honest, straightforward way of his, he voted his own convictions, and the people, while disagreeing with him upon that important question, always stood by him.

I knew him intimately in the House of Representatives. I loved him, and I think everyone else who knew him loved him—a kindly hearted man, a man of a noble soul, a man who had nothing of guile in his nature, a man who loved men because they were men, a man in whose word every one of his fellows had the most implicit confidence. His word was always as good as his bond. He stood high in the House. He was a member of the Post Office Committee in that body. He took an active and effective interest in all that came before that committee. He did much for roads and much for the building up of all the various branches of the Postal Service. I deeply regret his death, and shall ever cherish the memory of my departed friend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senators from Alabama and other States have spoken and will speak of the career of FREDERICK L. BLACKMON as a citizen of Alabama and as a faithful and capable Member of Congress. To me he was not only my associate in the Halls of Congress, but his birthplace and mine were in the same county in Georgia, and I can think of him only as a Polk County, Ga., boy who was living near me in my earliest years and who was among the best and closest friends since I came here as Director of the Census in 1913.

Because he was born and bred in my county and my State I wish to make a brief reference to the family, the community, and the county that gave him the natural endowments, the social standards, and the patriotic impulses which enabled

him to win his way to such distinguished service in his day and generation. A man is always the product of his nature and his nurture, of his inborn powers, and his experiences with the world about him—in short, of his heredity and his environment. It is through his family stock that he receives his nature, his inborn powers, and it is his home and community and State that make the nurture and provide the experiences which train him. If we would answer the question, How shall we account for the high achievements of our dead friend? we must go to the family stocks from whence he sprung and to the home and community in which he received his early training.

FREDERICK L. BLACKMON's mother was Sarah Ann Ross; his father was a physician, who lived on his farm in a community called Lime Branch, which is within 6 miles of Cedartown, where lived my own father, who was also a physician. Our fathers were personal friends and coworkers in the great profession which seeks to promote the health and strength of humanity.

Dr. Augustin Blackmon, the father of FREDERICK, was given the name of Augustin as a mark of admiration for a remarkable man, Augustin Young, who was a near neighbor and the grandfather of many noble men and women in my county and also the grandfather of the Hon. JAMES YOUNG, the very able and conscientious Member of Congress from Texas.

It was an unusually fine type of family stocks who lived as neighbors of Dr. Augustin Blackmon and cooperated with him in building that community spirit at Lime Branch which gave its schools, churches, roads, farms, and homes a standing far above that usually found. These families were, as their names will show, all derived from that Scotch-Irish strain that had settled Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, driving back the Indians, cutting down the forests, building the homes, bridging the rivers, making the laws, and giving a church and school to every community. The children and grandchildren of the settlers of Virginia and the Carolinas went to middle Georgia by the thousands between 1750 and 1800, and scarcely a generation had passed before thousands of their descendants had moved to western Georgia. As it was usually the most daring and the most enterprising of the younger generation that moved the empire of the white race westward, it was from the best of the human stocks of middle Georgia that came the young men and women that made the pioneer settlements in western Georgia. The very names of these families who settled in Lime Branch between 1830 and 1860 show that they were but the advanced lines of that great Scotch-Irish strain which left Europe to find freedom and the fortunes awaiting them in America. As you listen to these names you will find them all Anglo-Saxon or Scotch-Irish. Those who made the early settlers at Lime Branch were the Blackmons, Youngs, Coxes, Caseys, Pittmans, Hickses, Sewells, Hogs, Willinghams, Cleavelands, Merritts, Brewsters, Garners, Winkles, Wrays, and many others. Their forefathers and descendants have distinguished themselves in all the wars from the Revolutionary through to the World War.

Three miles south of Lime Branch lived William F. Janes, who as a member of the legislature introduced the bill creating Polk County. His son, Charles G. Janes, was judge of the Tallapoosa circuit for many years. The late Robert W. Everett, a successful teacher and farmer, who so ably represented the seventh congressional district in Congress, lived near by and taught many of those who lived in the Lime Branch neighborhood and other sections of Polk County.

These and others were the family stocks that gave prestige to Lime Branch and Polk County by their traditions and churches and schools, and which trained every child to the best ideals of manhood. It was the Blackmon-Ross marriage, both Scotch-Irish names, that gave to FREDERICK BLACKMON the ability and the training that secured for him the confidence and the leadership of the congressional district in Alabama to which his mother moved before his youth was completed. Mrs. David Lowry and Mrs. Samuel Hogg, two splendid women of Polk County, Ga., are sisters of FREDERICK BLACKMON.

I trust that the Senators will not think it improper for me to speak of these facts and names that apparently belong to one family and one county, for reflection will convince them that it is well to give honor to those firesides and those community influences which produce strong and noble men like FREDERICK BLACKMON.

From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
That makes her loved at home, revered abroad.
Princes and lords are but the breath of kings—
An honest man's the noblest work of God.

A boy born and bred in a rural community in Polk County, Ga.; moved in his youth to Alabama with his mother, who continued there the same inspiration to noble deeds, the same re-

spect for right and duty, the same urge to high achievements as had made the spirit of the home in Georgia; and the boy became the servant of his State and of all the United States in the halls of Congress. This is the continuing glory of our country.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the custom of holding memorial services out of respect for and in honor of a Member of Congress who died in the service is indeed a beautiful and praiseworthy custom. Here we are in the closing hours of the session and yet Congress halts its pressing, important business and lays aside its legislative program long enough to pay a tribute of love and esteem to two able and faithful Members who have so recently served here. Death has invaded the ranks of the Alabama delegation three times during the Sixty-sixth Congress. Three able and faithful servants of our people, one Senator and two Members of the House, have gone from these historic halls to their last resting place. When memorial services were held in the House in honor of Congressman Burnett I was a Member of that body and delivered one of the addresses on that occasion. I now desire to say a few words about my good friend and recent colleague in the House, FRED L. BLACKMON, who died just a few days ago while serving the fourth Alabama district in the Congress of the United States. He was only 48 years old when the summons came. In the midst of a brilliant and useful career, just in the prime of life, death called him and he left us to join that innumerable throng over yonder where there is no death, but life forever more.

Mr. President, years ago he was elected by the good people of Calhoun County to represent them in the Alabama State Senate. He had before coming to Congress legislative experience and training which wonderfully well equipped him for service in the lower House. He was elected from the fourth district of Alabama, the district adjoining the fifth, the one that I had the honor to represent for more than 16 years in the other branch of Congress.

The people of that district delighted to honor him and to have him as their representative in the greatest law-making body in the world. For 10 years the people of that district commissioned him as their representative and he had been elected to represent them in the Sixty-seventh Congress. After his last triumphant election he announced his intention to retire at the expiration of the Sixty-seventh Congress and go back into the practice of the law at Anniston, Ala. He was a splendid and a wonderfully successful lawyer, and had for years enjoyed the reputation of being one of the very best trial lawyers in our State. He was exceedingly popular with both judge and jury. He was a brave, manly man, a devoted friend, a good citizen, and an able and faithful Representative in Congress.

Mr. President, he will be missed and mourned by a large circle of devoted friends in Alabama and by those with whom he served so ably and well here in the Capitol of the Nation. In the brilliancy and buoyancy of a useful life, death touched his dreamless slumber to his eyelids and he fell asleep. He leaves a charming and devoted wife and two splendid children, Fred L., Jr., and Sara B. Blackmon, to mourn his loss. In his death Alabama has lost a distinguished, valuable, and popular citizen, and an able and faithful Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolutions submitted by my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). Without objection, the resolutions offered by the senior Senator from Alabama will be unanimously agreed to.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BROWNING.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 16, 1920.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended, that an opportunity may be given for tributes to the memory of Hon. WILLIAM J. BROWNING, late a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, and in recognition of his eminent abilities as a distinguished public servant, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial proceedings, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate.
Resolved, That the Clerk be instructed to send a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for their adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.
The Assistant Secretary read the resolutions (S. Res. 470), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with deep sorrow of the death of Hon. WILLIAM J. BROWNING, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute may be paid to his high character and distinguished public services.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, nearly a year ago the irresistible hand of death brought to a sudden close the career of a distinguished statesman, WILLIAM J. BROWNING.

In the fullness of years, at the zenith of a profitable life, with the harness on, he went to his reward.

The late Representative from the first district was in every respect the architect of his own fortune and the source and inspiration of his whole fruitful career.

When yet a lad, hardly out of the period of infancy, he became an orphan, his father dying while yet in the early meridian of life. I mention this as a "handicap," yet I am not sure that I use the word wisely. It may be that this great loss, when the lad was still very young, was the child's gain. As he advanced along the pathway of life, even in those early years, he was thrown upon his own resources entirely, and thus developed those characteristics of industry and initiative which he might never have acquired had he been entirely dependent in boyhood upon a father's care and protection.

This lack, in the case of young BROWNING, toughened the fiber of his being and produced in him certain qualities which made for success in after life.

Fortunately, while the head of the household was removed, the mother remained, a woman of great strength of character, possessing a well-disciplined mind and actuated by the sterling principles of the Society of Friends, to which she belonged. She played a dual rôle, being father and mother in one, and aided materially in shaping the son's subsequent career.

Educated at Friends Central High School, Philadelphia, working during recesses on his uncle's farm in New Jersey, he entered a mercantile house in the Quaker City as office boy, he being then about 15 years of age. Upon attaining his majority, he became a member of the firm.

But the lure of public service seems to have fastened its hold upon him in early life in spite of his Quaker training. Early participating in the political movements of his day in his native city—Camden—he soon became a leader among the young men of his neighborhood.

The first important post held by him was that of member of the city council. Then he was made a member of the board of education, and became chairman of the same, performing, with satisfaction to the community, the duties of that responsible post. In due time, under the Harrison administration, he was made postmaster at Camden, and here, too, he served the public, and the Government as well, with full credit and acceptability.

His entrance into the domain of national affairs took place in December, 1895, when he was chosen Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives. This station he filled for 16 years.

He performed the duties of that office with a degree of efficiency never surpassed, and in so doing won the unanimous friendship of practically every Member of that body.

Upon the death of his friend and immediate representative, Congressman Loudenslager, August 12, 1911, BROWNING was chosen a Member of the Sixty-second Congress. In due course he was reelected to the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, and Sixty-sixth Congresses. In 1912, during the Democratic upheaval, resulting from the split in his own party, BROWNING was the only Republican who carried a congressional district in New Jersey, though in the Sixty-seventh Congress but a single Democrat will represent the State.

In the House BROWNING's service was preeminently valuable by reason of his long identification with that body as Chief Clerk and Member. Quiet and rather conservative, he was nevertheless indefatigable in his attendance upon the sessions of Congress and of the committees upon which he served. He had a wonderful propensity for detail and for the minutia of legislation, having everything at his fingers' ends.

Coming to the Senate four years ago, entirely unfamiliar with the methods of Federal legislation at the outset, I found Congressman BROWNING helpful at all times, ready with advice and suggestion in the work of parliamentary procedure.

He was a safe and able representative of the material interests of the important district which honored him with a seat in Congress, and his death was a great loss to his party, his State, and the Nation which he so honorably served.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I simply want to add a word in tribute to the memory of the late Congressman BROWNING. It was typical of his conscientious service that he passed away, as it were, in the saddle, actually in the Capitol itself.

It was my good fortune to be very intimately acquainted with Congressman BROWNING. I lived for many years in the adjoining county. His earnest work in public life was always an inspiration to me, and I have followed his career with great interest and great benefit. I consider that Congressman BROWNING represented a type of public man who considered public service perhaps somewhat different from the accepted scope of the responsibilities of the day. He was one of those men who appreciated the importance of the little things. He looked upon every case presented to him by constituents, whether it was some small pension matter, some officer of the Government who perhaps had made an error, or some difficulties in connection with the service of the soldiers in the late war, war insurance, or other detail matters—he looked upon any of those cases referred to his office as in themselves individual responsibilities, big matters, because they were big matters to whoever presented the particular applications. His work was one of great detail, and to-day I think the average Member of Congress, perhaps pardonably so, makes an effort to get away from detail.

Mr. BROWNING, as well, was a member of a very important committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and served on that committee from the commencement of his services in the House until the time of his passing away. I know from personal contact with him that he was deeply interested in the development of the Navy of the United States, worked zealously as a member of the committee; and residing, as he did, in the State of New Jersey, right on the Delaware River, near the navy yard—and even when Congress was not in session he was continually actively engaged in the development of that river and yard.

New Jersey, in losing Congressman BROWNING, lost an efficient, conscientious, representative public servant. New Jersey mourns his loss, because they respected him. The first congressional district mourns his loss, because they loved him.

Mr. President, in performing this sad duty, I am glad to have the opportunity of paying this tribute to the memory of so conscientious a public servant.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975), making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill for action on the committee amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	McLean	Simmons
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Harris	Moses	Smith, Md.
Calder	Harrison	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Swanson
Dillingham	Keyes	Owen	Thomas
Edge	King	Phipps	Townsend
Elkins	Kirby	Poin Dexter	Trammell
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
France	Lenroot	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Shields	Willis
Glass	McKellar		Willcott

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand that the naval appropriation bill is before the Senate as the unfinished business, and I desire to make a point of order against its further consideration, under the second paragraph of Rule XXVI, which provides that—

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects in which the committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

This being the same legislative day on which the naval appropriation bill was reported to the Senate, it has not yet laid over one day since it was reported by the committee to the Senate. I therefore make the point of order, and object to the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the bill has been considered by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but the Chair must maintain the ruling that has heretofore been made by the present Presiding Officer, from which an appeal can be taken, and the Senate will then definitely settle the question. The Chair has heretofore ruled that except upon unanimous consent, a bill may not be considered on the same legislative day on which it was reported. The Chair accordingly sustains the point of order.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I take an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? The Chair may be permitted to remark that he thinks it important that this question should be settled, and settled now. The ruling of the Chair is in strict conformity with the rulings in similar situations in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not think I quite understand the point. The naval appropriation bill is now the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it is the unfinished business—made so, however, upon a motion, and made so on this legislative day, and reported to the Senate on this legislative day. The Senator from New Mexico objects, and the rule says that if there is an objection, it can not be taken up the same day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not so understand the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An appeal has been taken from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I have the privilege of making a remark for a moment in regard to it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has taken an appeal, and it is open to discussion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I want to call attention to the language of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is fair for the Chair to state that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] made identically the same point of order against the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I beg the Chair's pardon. I did not make the same point of order against the Senator from New Mexico, for the reason that the conditions were entirely different from the conditions under which the pending naval appropriation bill is situated in the Senate in a parliamentary sense. This bill has been under the consideration of the Senate for several days by order of the Senate. Consequently, it has been "otherwise directed," within the language of the rule, as to the consideration of it upon the same day upon which it was reported.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The "otherwise directed" provision of the rule relates to unanimous consent. The express provision of the rule is that "unless the Senate shall otherwise direct by unanimous consent," which, of course, implies that it can not be done by a mere majority vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There was no objection. Consequently it must have been by unanimous consent that we have proceeded with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. There was objection, and a vote was taken on it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I know; but we have had several recesses since then and have proceeded since with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. We have not had any adjournment, however.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; but we have had recesses.

Mr. BORAH. I tried to get an adjournment and could not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; that is true. These are not the same at all as the conditions under which the bill of the Senator from New Mexico is presented, and for this reason—and that is all I desire to call attention to—that the bill he wished to have considered had not been taken up and had not been under consideration. The naval appropriation bill has been taken up at repeated sessions of the Senate, continued by recess from time to time, and to-day it was taken up without objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word on the point of order. I do not think there is any question that the ruling of the Chair should stand as the decision of the Senate. The Chair has decided that the point of order is well taken, but an appeal has been taken from that ruling of the Chair. It seems to me that the interpretation of the rule is not only correct, but it is a good rule.

There is no reason why we should not have an adjournment in order that the Senate may take a vote upon whether it will consider another committee report or not. It was apparent to me on yesterday and on the day before that there was little likelihood of the naval appropriation bill becoming a law at this session. I made an attempt to get up for the consideration of the Senate the soldiers' bonus bill or adjusted-compensation bill. It was ruled by the Chair, and I think properly ruled, that the motion was out of order because the report of the committee had not been before the Senate for a legislative day.

I have no special antipathy toward the consideration of the Navy bill if it can be done in a regular and orderly way, but I believe there should be an adjournment so that the Senate may have an opportunity to vote upon the question of taking up for consideration the report of some other committee. An adjournment will provide an opportunity for recent reports to lie over for a legislative day.

I shall not take occasion to read the precedents on the question, but it has been the uniform ruling, so far as I have been advised, that a point of order of this kind can be made at any time. Rule XX provides:

A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings.

The objection or the criticism of the Senator from Washington that the point of order should not be made now can not be well founded.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it seems to me the only question of law involved in the ruling of the Chair is whether he has correctly considered the requirements that all reports from committees shall lie over one day unless unanimous consent be procured for their consideration, the question turning upon the meaning of the word "day." The Chair has construed it to mean a legislative day. In one or two instances at least that I recall a different construction has been placed upon the rule, and the word "day" has been held to mean calendar day. I think, however, that the weight of precedents and the weight of argument support the ruling of the Chair.

We all know the object of a legislative day. We know why that fiction has been created making a legislative day at the pleasure of the Senate extend over a period of many calendar days. It is to obviate the very difficulties which in many instances would arise if we conformed our proceedings to the calendar day. There is no question in my mind that the Chair has ruled correctly on the subject. There is a way out of the difficulty which the Senate will readily see, if it chooses to take it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a further view of the matter. The rule is against taking up a report of the committee. It reads:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and all subjects in which the committee shall be discharged, shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

The bill did not lie over. Whatever may have been the process by which it was arrived at, it did not lie over, and it was under consideration and is before the Senate at the present time, so that a different stage has been reached from that which is referred to in the rule.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 20 minutes after 4 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., Wednesday, Mar. 2, 1921) adjourned until Wednesday, March 2, 1921, at 4.20 o'clock p. m.

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1921.

The Senate met at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was not sufficient time to send for the Chaplain of the Senate. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of February 24, 1921.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what was the motion?

Mr. LODGE. That the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts requests that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

Mr. BORAH. I object.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the motion be put.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make the point of order that the motion is out of order, that the Journal must be read on objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that the only way to dispense with the reading of the Journal is by unanimous consent, it being the right of each Senator or any particular Senator to have the Journal read if he so desires. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the last legislative day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, February 24, 1921, and after having read for some time,

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I renew my request that the further reading of the Journal be dispensed with, so that we may have the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand there are some other bills to be taken up which may be considered in the morning hour, and I shall not make any objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to dispensing with the further reading of the Journal? The Chair hears none, and the Journal will stand approved. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEYES presented a resolution of the New Hampshire Retail Jewelers' Association, of Manchester, N. H., favoring a turnover sales tax of 1 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER,
Washington, February 22, 1921.

SIR: At the direction of the Vice President, I have the honor to forward the inclosed communication for your consideration.

Respectfully,

MARK THISTLETHWAITE,
Secretary.

HON. PORTER J. McCUMBER,
United States Senate.

Concurrent resolution introduced by Mr. Baker.

Urging the Congress of the United States to enact into law the bill entitled "A bill for the public protection of maternity and infancy, and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States," and known as the Sheppard-Towner bill.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be urged to pass and enact the bill known as the Sheppard-Towner bill, entitled "A bill for the public protection of maternity and infancy, and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States. That the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota are in favor of the passage of such measure at the earliest possible moment; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate at Washington, D. C.

This is to certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution originated in the Senate of the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, and was adopted.

H. R. WOOD,
President of the Senate.

W. J. PRATER,

Secretary of the Senate.

L. L. THORCHELL,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

C. LOONSON,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a resolution of the State Senate of the Legislature of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Standards, Weights, and Measures and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution on metric system, introduced by Mr. O. C. Gross by request. Whereas there is in the United States a deplorable lack of uniformity in weights and measures, and the units used are unscientific, cumbersome, and unrelated, constituting an actual hindrance to education, industry, world trade, and the activities of daily life; and

Whereas the metric system of weights and measures is a decimal system, simple, logical, and easy to use, so that its adoption will result in an incalculable saving in time and energy; and

Whereas the metric system has been adopted by the vast majority of enlightened nations, and its adoption by the United States is calculated to promote friendly relations and commerce with all the world; and

Whereas the State of North Dakota, by reason of its great commercial and industrial activities, is vitally interested, both as a State and in behalf of its citizens, in the speedy adoption of world-wide uniform standards of weights and measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Senate of the State of North Dakota respectfully urges that the units of the metric system be adopted by

the Congress of the United States as the legal standard of weights and measures after a transition period of 10 years, as proposed in bills now before Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be forwarded to the President of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

I, W. J. PRATER, secretary of the Senate of the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution on metric system was adopted in the senate.

W. J. PRATER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a resolution of Minot Council, No. 1150, of the Knights of Columbus, of Minot, N. Dak., protesting against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McNARY presented a resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Territories as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 3 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 23, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 24th day of February, A. D. 1921.

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial 3.

Whereas the salmon industry is the third largest within the State of Oregon, and returns to the State many millions of dollars annually, which at once becomes a part of its taxable assets through the regular channels of trade; and

Whereas the streams of Oregon and the Columbia River, over which Oregon and Washington have concurrent jurisdiction with respect to the fish therein, have been rehabilitated as salmon streams; and

Whereas said rehabilitation has been the result of the propagation of salmon fry; and

Whereas the streams and waters of said State were until the year 1914 showing the effects of the destruction of natural spawning beds and areas on the upper reaches of the streams within the State and other causes; and

Whereas since the year 1914 the pack of canned salmon on the Columbia River and the coast streams of Oregon has increased more than 250 per cent, due to artificial propagation of salmon fry and the liberation of the same in the waters of Oregon; and

Whereas the life of the industry is now being threatened by the use of purse seines and similar devices at the mouths of the rivers and streams of Oregon and in the waters of the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas said purse seines destroy annually untold numbers of immature and young salmon on the feeding grounds offshore at the mouths of the rivers of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas such destruction of the young salmon is inimical to the industry, and if permitted to continue is apt to result in the complete inability of the hatcheries to provide an adequate return run of salmon in the streams after they have reached maturity on the feeding grounds in the waters of the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance, not only to the State of Oregon but to the States of California and Washington, the Territory of Alaska, and the Province of British Columbia, that means be devised to protect the salmon on its feeding grounds all along the coast of the United States and the Dominion of Canada bordering on the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas Hon. CHARLES McNARY, representing the State of Oregon in the Senate of the United States Congress, has introduced a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to negotiate a treaty between the United States and Great Britain to protect the salmon in the waters of the Pacific Ocean bordering on the United States and Dominion of Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be memorialized to use their influence to secure the passage of legislation to the end that a treaty may be entered into between the two high contracting parties herein mentioned to prevent the use of the destructive forms of gear heretofore mentioned and to protect the salmon upon the feeding grounds and preserve for all time this important industry to the Territory of Alaska, the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, and the Province of British Columbia, and that a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate February 19, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 21, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. McNARY presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 12 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 23, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 24th day of February, A. D. 19—.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial No. 12.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America:

We, your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that:

Whereas House bill 15854 provides for the establishment of the grade of lieutenant general in the Armies of the United States.

Whereas the commander of the American fighting forces in the field during the World War held the grade of lieutenant general.

Whereas the commander of the First Army of the American Expeditionary Forces, who stopped the German Army on the Marne and forced a collapse of the German Empire in the Argonne, was reduced to the grade of major general upon his return to the United States.

Whereas such reduction was made by reason of legal limitations in the organization of the Army, which laws did not contemplate the proper recognition of the commander of the First Army.

Whereas the reduction in grade of the commander of America's First Army abroad was inconsistent with the gratitude of the American people for services so rendered.

Resolved by the House of Representatives of Oregon, the Senate concurring, That we memorialize Congress immediately to enact into law House bill 15854, in order that the rank of lieutenant general of the Army may be restored to Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett, who won his promotion by conspicuous and gallant military service and devotion to duty.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the seal of his office, to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress, and to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate February 21, 1921.

(Signed)

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House February 19, 1921.

(Signed)

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 12. Introduced by Messrs. Leonard and Hammond. W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed February 23, 1921. Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Galveston, Tex., favoring the recognition of the Irish republic and also the immediate recall of the loan made to Great Britain during the World War, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WASHINGTON MARKET CO.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Corporations Organized in the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9036) to repeal and annul certain parts of the charter and lease granted and made to the Washington Market Co. by act of Congress entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Market Co.," approved May 20, 1870, and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BALL. I report back favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, the bill (H. R. 9036) to repeal and annul certain parts of the charter and lease granted and made to the Washington Market Co. by act of Congress entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Market Co.," approved May 20, 1870, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MOSES subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 9036, reported by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was an objection. Is there further objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

Mr. KEYES, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 232) permitting Chinese to register under certain provisions and conditions, reported it without amendment.

Mr. LENROOT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to, and the bills were indefinitely postponed:

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Elijah Stroud;

S. 3765. A bill for the relief of Rhodilla Silvers; and

S. 3990. A bill placing Lieut. Col. Charles C. Teare, of the Judge Advocate General's Department, on the retired list and to retire him with the rank and pay of a lieutenant colonel on the retired list.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5044) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Hall's Ferry and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga. I report it without amendment and submit a report (No. 827) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is absolutely nothing in the bill but merely the permission to build the bridge.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The bill we have been trying to get passed for several days, and which the Senator has been insisting on defeating, is nothing at all but the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What is that? I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let the Senator read the Record.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Did I understand the Senator to say that I was here attempting to defeat the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I said the Senator had occupied a great deal of time and had participated in defeating the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I absolutely repudiate that as being altogether unfounded and uncalled for.

Mr. LODGE. The regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other reports of committees? Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) admitting Emil S. Fischer to the rights and privileges of a citizen of the United States, reported it without amendment.

CREDITS UNDER LIBERTY LOAN ACTS.

Mr. REED. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report the following resolution in behalf of the committee, and I ask that it be read. I then shall ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I object to its reading, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is only a resolution to authorize carrying on an investigation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate that, and I do not know that I have any objection to it; but there is a great mass of similar business, and if we give way in the right we have under the rules to one, we shall be compelled to give way to all. That is the situation in which we have been placed for three days in trying to get consideration for an appropriation bill. So I am compelled, as much as I regret to do it, to object, with this suggestion to the Senator, that there will undoubtedly be an opportunity before the adjournment of this session of Congress to bring the matter up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can wind this up. The resolution calls for an expenditure of money and will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from Washington for permitting me to report the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 471) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to investigate and ascertain what credits have been established and what commitments, advancements, and payments have been made or are claimed to have been made by authority of the four Liberty loan acts, the Victory loan act, or any other acts of Congress granting the Secretary of the Treasury authority to accept the obligations of foreign Governments for moneys, munitions, or supplies furnished them by the United States Government and the reasons for making said credits, commitments, advances, or payments; and

That the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, or during the recesses between the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses; and

That the committee or any subcommittee thereof be authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost of not to exceed \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with this investigation; and

That the expenses contracted thereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRONNA (by request):

A bill (S. 5046) to tax the privilege of dealing on exchanges, boards of trade, and similar places in contracts of sale or purchase of grain for future delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5047) to provide for the relief of certain employees of the Government who have become eligible for retirement under the provisions of the retirement act of May 22, 1920, and have thereafter been continued in the service or reemployed therein; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 5048) to survey the Yazoo River, Miss., with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Commerce.

FUTURE CONTRACTS FOR FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the officers in charge of the exchanges and markets where future contracts for farm products are dealt in are requested to suspend speculative short sales in farm products from notice of this request until August 1, 1921.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15975, the bill making appropriations for the naval service.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, we had made considerable progress on this bill, and had adopted the first amendment, I think. I ask that the reading for action on the committee amendments be continued.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 3, line 14, under the item "Pay, miscellaneous," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000," so as to read:

And not to exceed \$400,000 for telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams and cablegrams; postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; and other necessary and incidental expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to strike out:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the expense of any naval district unless the commandant thereof shall be also the commandant of a navy yard, naval training station, or naval operating base.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the word "provided" to strike out the word "further."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$850,000," so as to read:

That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards and naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, shall not exceed \$850,000.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. In view of the renewed motion to take up the bill for consideration following the adjournment, I should like to ask whether that affects the previous action of the Senate on the amendments that have gone before?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks not. Whatever has been done has been done.

Mr. KING. I ask the Senator having the bill in charge the reason for an increase in that item over the amount of \$100,000 as contained in the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. POINDEXTER. One reason is that the Senate committee has based the appropriation upon a navy personnel of 120,000, instead of 100,000. Of course, if the question of the personnel of the Navy should remain as the basis of these appropriations, the appropriation would be less than that recommended by the Senate committee. During the war the expenses for this item amounted to about \$11,000,000, and for the current year the expenditure for that purpose is \$1,000,000. The Navy Department was very urgent in its request for a larger sum than that which is allowed by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I beg pardon for interrupting the Senator, but I would like to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session this afternoon or this evening it shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Let me tell my friend that I would have concluded before this if it had not been for interruptions. I have been led into so many digressions that I have been unable to conclude. When I rose I intended to occupy perhaps only half an hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have been very much entertained by the Senator's speech.

Mr. KING. It is very kind of the Senator to say that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Henderson	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Hitchcock	Myers	Smoot
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Phelan	Townsend
Dillingham	Kenyon	Philips	Underwood
Fernald	Keyes	Poinexter	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	King	Pomerene	Warren
France	Knox	Reed	Willis
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	Lodge	Sheppard	
Gooding	McCumber	Shields	
Hale	McKellar	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 12, 53, 70, 71, and 84, and agreed to the same; that it had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 22, 34, 54, 106, and 113, and agreed to the same; that it had insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 18, 23, 104, and 105, requested a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. SLEMP, Mr. DENT, and Mr. Sisson managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1551) to amend an act approved March 3, 1891, incorporating the National Conservatory of Music of America.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 5032. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Shirland Avenue, in the city of Beloit, Wis.; and

H. R. 13225. An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

SAVANNAH RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5044) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is a bill, which I understand will require no debate whatever, being a mere routine bridge bill. I have no objection to its consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to J. J. Smith and J. E. McGee, both of Starr, S. C., and their assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 14, 17, 24, 25, 32, 33, 39, 40, 41, 45, 52, 55, 58, 60, 66, 67, 68, 73, 79, 80, 83, 87, 91, 97, 100, 101, 107, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 38, 42, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 59, 62, 63, 69, 72, 74, 75, 81, 82, 85, 86, 98, 99, 102, 103, 108, 110, 111, and 112; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$600,000 from this appropriation may be expended for salaries and wages of civilian employees; not to exceed \$450,000 may be expended for commercial and existing Government-owned telephone and telegraph service; not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be expended for signal equipment for organizations; not to exceed \$7,500 may be expended for pigeon service; not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for photographic and cinematographic service; and not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for the operation and maintenance of Camp Alfred Vail"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$28,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert: "\$27,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment insert the following: "Provided, That from this appropriation, not to exceed \$1,750,000 shall be expended for the pay of civilian employees; not to exceed \$1,750,000 shall be expended for power, heat, and electric current, of which not exceeding \$42,300 may be used for improvement of electric power supply system at Governors Island, N. Y.; not to exceed \$100,000 shall be expended for

maintenance and repair of buildings (including repair of machinery) for laundries; not to exceed \$300,000 shall be expended for the maintenance and repair of heating apparatus (other than stoves); not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and repair of electric wiring and fixtures; not to exceed \$10,000 for the repair and exchange of typewriters; not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the operation of laundries; not to exceed \$6,500,000 for fuel; not to exceed \$8,500,000 for forage, including salt and vinegar and bedding for animals, and straw for soldiers' bedding; not to exceed \$405,000 for ice; and not to exceed \$600,000 shall be expended for stationery: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, such horses and mules now being held at remount stations and posts as are not in actual use, and in any event not less than 10,000 of such animals shall be sold"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "*Provided*, That from this appropriation not exceeding \$3,000,000 shall be expended for the hire of labor; not exceeding \$3,500,000 shall be expended for the pay of civilian employees other than laborers; not exceeding \$75,000 shall be expended for telegrams, cablegrams, and postage; and not exceeding \$25,000 shall be expended for experimental and development work"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "roads," insert "not less than one-half by sale"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate insert "\$200,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment, restore the matter stricken out, and in the matter so restored strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of

the sum proposed, insert "\$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$9,750,000; *Provided*, That 20 per centum of the foregoing amounts for arming, equipping, and training the National Guard shall be available interchangeably for expenditure for the purposes named, but not more than 20 per centum shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,906,404.80"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 18, 22, 23, 34, 53, 54, 70, 71, 84, 104, 105, 106, and 113.

J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
HARRY S. NEW,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

D. R. ANTHONY, JR.,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
C. BASCOM SLEMP,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The reading clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 53, 70, 71, and 84 to the bill (H. R. 15943) entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes," and agrees to the same.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agrees to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate, insert the following: "\$21,100,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding \$250,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium; not exceeding \$4,300,000 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding \$500,000 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; and not exceeding \$350,000 may be expended for improvement of stations, hangars, and gas plants: *Provided further*, That not less than \$5,500,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories: *Provided further*,

That claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post, and approved by the Chief of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$10,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "... and shall also furnish to each transportation in kind from the place of discharge to the railroad station at or nearest to the place of acceptance for enlistment, or to his home if the distance thereto is no greater than from the place of discharge to the place of acceptance for enlistment, but if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of acceptance for enlistment; and the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment, before the word "enlisted," insert "officers and."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "July" and insert in lieu thereof "April."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "expended," in the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert " : *Provided*, That 60 per cent of this sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the Treasury of the United States."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert " : *Provided*, That these civilian instructors employed in the department of modern languages and the department of tactics shall be entitled to public quarters and fuel and light."

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 23, 104, and 105, and asks a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. SLEMP, Mr. DENT, and Mr. Sisson be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 22, 34, 54, 106, and 113.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 18, 23, 104, and 105, and ask for a further conference.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator kindly state the subject matter of those disagreements?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can make a statement very briefly which will describe the situation accurately, I think.

The only matters in disagreement between the two Houses at this time are, first, the item of the appropriations for pay of the enlisted men of the line and staff. That amendment is amendment numbered 18, and an amendment which goes with it, and is dependent upon the settlement of amendment numbered 13, is amendment numbered 23.

Amendment numbered 104 is the amendment adopted by the Senate providing for the promotion to the grade of lieutenant general of Gens. Liggett and Bullard.

Amendment numbered 105 is the amendment offered to the bill by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], having to do with decorations resulting from service during the War with Spain.

It may be fair and accurate to state that the principal item in disagreement is the pay of enlisted men, line and staff. The Senate appropriation is \$83,000,000. The House appropriation is \$72,300,000, in round figures. This item is the item which controls, to a large degree, the size of the Army for the fiscal year 1922. The Senate appropriation would permit of the pay of an Army, including the Philippine Scouts, of 175,000 men for one year.

The House appropriation would permit the pay of an Army averaging 150,000 men for the year. Under the Senate proposal the Army, starting upon July 1 next at a strength of 207,000, which it is estimated it will be at that time, as the result of the expiration of enlistments that are now taking place, would be reduced, by the end of the next fiscal year, to a figure in the neighborhood of 160,000 or 162,000, ending the fiscal year with an Army of that strength. Under the House appropriation, starting on July 1 next with a strength approximately of 207,000 men, the Army would be reduced to a strength of 122,000 men at the end of the next fiscal year.

I think it fair and proper for me to say to the Senate that when this matter of reducing the Army of the United States to a strength of 122,000 at the end of the next fiscal year was discussed in conference, the proposal was made, and sustained

with argument, that under the House appropriation the strength of the Army need not be decreased to 122,000 at the end of the next fiscal year; that it should be the policy of the War Department, between now and July 1 next, before the beginning of the next fiscal year, to reduce the Army to such a strength at the beginning of the fiscal year as to make it possible to have an average of 150,000 men during the next fiscal year.

If that were done, and that theory carried into practice, between 85,000 and 90,000 men would have to be arbitrarily discharged from the Regular Army between now and July 1 next, resulting, in the judgment of the Senate conferees, in utter disruption of the Army we now have, making it impossible for any unit of that Army to take the field upon any undertaking or activity whatsoever for months and months to come; amounting, in fact, to this, that not only would the Army be decreased by the normal expiration of enlistments, but beyond that, the War Department would have to step down the ranks of the men, figuratively speaking, touch man after man upon the shoulder, and say to him "Get out," breaking their contracts and interrupting their training.

The Senate conferees—up to this point, at least, and I imagine they will stand upon this question—can not consent to the arbitrary discharge of 90,000 men in any such short period as that, the conferees being convinced that not only during the period between now and July 1 next, but for many months thereafter, we would have no Army at all; and when I say that, I mean an Army competent to do anything in the matter of active service.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have not the bill before me, but am I to understand that there is a provision in the bill which would permit of the resignation of soldiers, or withdrawal from the Army, if they so desire, so as to reduce the number to the 175,000 to which the Senate has sought to limit it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is, and that item has been agreed upon in conference, and a legislative provision expediting the discharge of men upon their own desire.

Mr. POMERENE. I asked that question especially because I know that the Army has now in excess of 175,000, and I happen to know some soldiers who are anxious to get out, and have been advised that there was no authority under the present law to release them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We give the authority, and that matter has been agreed upon.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon these amendments, and that the House be asked for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. NEW, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. McKellar conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The READING CLERK. The pending amendment is the amendment of the committee on page 4, line 3, to strike out "\$750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 4, line 10, to strike out "\$3,500,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000," so as to read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards and naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, shall not exceed \$850,000, and for necessary expenses for the interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction, and for payment of claims for damages under naval act approved July 11, 1919; in all, \$4,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am glad that after three days' discussion we have at last reached the point where there can be some real consideration of the items in the bill. The pending item is one that, in my judgment, ought to remain where the House placed it. The Senate committee amendment ought to be rejected.

There are only two classes of appropriations in the bill—one class dependent upon a policy that shall be adopted with regard to construction and with regard to personnel, and another class

of appropriation not dependent upon either the construction or the size of the personnel of the Navy except to a very limited extent.

Some of the items of appropriation in the bill fall under one class, some under another, and some of them include both classes. The amendment now pending is one of the class that is not dependent upon construction. It is not dependent upon personnel. It is an item where the cost will be practically the same whether we have an enlisted personnel of 100,000 or 120,000. Moreover, it is an item, or an aggregation of items, where there is an opportunity for the department to use economy, which is not true, of course, of many items which are in the nature of fixed charges, such as pay of the enlisted personnel and the officers of the Navy.

Under this heading, if we will apply the same rule to the Navy Department that we have applied to the War Department, as other committees have applied to other departments of the Government, this increase of \$500,000 will not be agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us the amount that was appropriated for this purpose last year?

Mr. LENROOT. The amount appropriated for this purpose last year in the appropriation bill was \$3,500,000. The other day in the deficiency bill there was an additional appropriation of \$650,000, which makes a total expenditure for this fiscal year under this item of \$4,150,000. But out of that \$4,150,000 there is being expended this year \$232,000 for the transportation of funds for which the department says next year they will not require more than \$50,000. So that according to the department itself, eliminating this item of something like \$180,000 for the transportation of funds, the committee proposes to give to the Navy under this item as much money as they are spending this year.

As I said, in every other department of the Government, especially where civilian employees are involved, we have been cutting them down. One of the gross extravagances of this administration in all departments is the overhead expense. In this very item there is included \$1,000,000 for compensation of clerks. I have forgotten the number, but I think it is something like 600.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. We had exactly the same kind of proposition before that committee as to cutting down the overhead, and we cut it down. We were effecting economies in the cost of running the Army; and in the present condition of the Treasury it would seem to me that we ought to compel the different departments of the Government to cut out a very considerable percentage of their overhead. We on this side of the Chamber especially have taken the position that there have been gross extravagances by the different departments of the Government, and we have promised that we are going to eliminate those extravagances; yet when we come to the very first item in the naval bill which involves these various matters, where economies may be effected if they can be effected anywhere in the Government, the committee proposes by this amendment to give as much as the department are spending this year. If every other committee shall follow the same policy as has been pursued in the case of this item, there will be no way on earth under which the expenses of the Government may be lessened or reduced, and the promise which the Republican Party has made can never be redeemed.

More than that, Mr. President, it is not fair to the Army to compel the Army to cut down its overhead and get upon an economical basis and then say to the Navy, "So far as your overhead is concerned, we are going to give you just as much as you have had in the past, which we have heretofore condemned."

Furthermore, in 1916 the appropriation for this item—which is, I say, not dependent except in a very small degree upon the size of the personnel—the appropriation for this item which the committee now proposes to raise to \$4,000,000 was \$1,000,000.

Mr. BORAH. When was that?

Mr. LENROOT. That was in 1916, and there was also a deficiency that year of \$200,000. So the total expenditures for the items the appropriation for which the committee now proposes to raise to \$4,000,000 in 1916 was \$1,200,000.

That has nothing to do with the increase of the Navy, and has very little to do with the increase of the personnel of the Navy. In fact, I believe at that time we had something like eighty-four or eighty-five thousand men in the enlisted personnel in the Navy. Now, if we are going to keep on increasing the overhead expenses of the different departments of the Government by 300 per cent or more—and that is what it is proposed to do in this instance—where are we going to stop? Where is this thing going to end? Mr. President, this has nothing to do

with the policy whether we are for an enlisted personnel of 100,000 or 120,000.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to follow the Senator's argument. I ask the Senator what this item carried in 1916?

Mr. LENROOT. It carried \$1,000,000 and there was a deficiency of \$200,000; so that the total expenditure for 1916 for what we now propose to appropriate \$4,000,000 was \$1,200,000.

As I have said, Mr. President, it is not fair to the other departments of the Government to cut them down as we have and to let the overhead of the Navy go right on as it is going. As I said a little while ago, the estimate proposes \$1,000,000 for clerk hire on this one item alone. In that connection, speaking of the overhead of the Navy, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what we are paying this year for certain classes only of civilian employees. Turning to the Book of Estimates, I find that for salaries of clerks, draftsmen, inspectors, chemists, messengers, watchmen, and so forth, in the navy yards, naval stations, and so forth, we are proposing to spend this year \$20,220,000. I do not believe there is anyone—and I make the statement because of the investigation I have made of expenditures in the War Department—who will investigate the subject who will not say that that item can not be cut in two without any injury to the Government. So, Mr. President, I do not think there is any justification for the increase of \$500,000 in the item.

May I add that, if the Senate is going to keep up this overhead, this unnecessary expense, that adds nothing to the efficiency of the Navy, that has nothing to do with the size of the Navy, the very friends of an efficient Navy will find in the future that the country in its opposition to these enormous expenses is going to charge it all up to the size of the Navy and the personnel of the Navy, just as they are doing as to the Army. If a larger personnel is desired, if a larger Navy is desired, the best way to secure them is to cut out every dollar of unnecessary expenditures. That can be done by cutting out this overhead. So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I simply want to say a word in regard to this item. It is 33½ per cent lower than the amount which was estimated by the department. The item of \$3,500,000 in the House bill was estimated upon the basis of an enlisted strength of 100,000 men.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] says that the item is not affected by that. It is true that it is not affected directly, but it is affected to a considerable extent indirectly, in that the services which are provided for by this item will be increased if the enlisted strength of the Navy is raised from an average of 100,000 men to an average of 120,000 men, as it is at present. It is much less than the expenditure that was incurred last year. The appropriations recommended by the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs are based upon the supposition that the Navy will be maintained at the same strength that it was last year and the same strength as it is during the current year.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator point out any item under this heading that is affected by the size of the personnel?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For 120,000 instead of 100,000 men, more clerks are necessary in keeping the accounts of expenditures. That item is included in this provision.

Mr. LENROOT. How much is that item?

Mr. POINDEXTER. One million dollars was estimated last year and \$1,250,000 was estimated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it not true that the hearings show that the clerks were mostly used in keeping up the records of the Naval Reserve?

Mr. POINDEXTER. They showed that, to a considerable extent, they were used for that purpose.

Mr. LENROOT. That work is not affected by the size of the personnel.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; but that is not the entire employment of these clerks.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but a very large proportion of this expense is for mileage of officers and expenses of that kind that are not affected by the size of the personnel.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is true; I did not say that it was entirely controlled by the size of the personnel.

Mr. LENROOT. A very small part of it is affected by the size of the personnel.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible to estimate, without much more examination than the Senator and myself have been able to give it, exactly how much. It is a minor part, but still

a considerable part. Most of these items are items which are very accurately fixed by the charges that it is necessary to meet for the services which are rendered; for instance, the traveling expenses of officers.

Mr. LENROOT. As to the traveling expenses of officers, I will say we found in the case of the Army that the traveling expenses of officers can be very largely controlled by the amount appropriated. It is not necessary on some slight pretext to send an officer from the city of New York to San Francisco and another officer to take his place from San Francisco back to the city of New York, when that money could be saved, and it would be saved, if the appropriations are kept down. It will not be saved unless the appropriations are kept down.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am aware there are extravagances in these various services; I do not defend that for one moment, but I think the Senator will find upon examination that there has been a great deal more recklessness in expenditures in the War Department than there has been in the Navy Department. When the committee reduced the amount that was required by the various items included under the heading for which this appropriation is made from \$6,000,000, which it was insisted by the department was necessary, to \$4,000,000, we thought that we were acting in the interest of economy.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Can we expect to retrench expenditures if we are going to give the various departments as much money as they are spending for the current fiscal year? That is what we are doing in the case of this item.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not entirely as much.

Mr. LENROOT. What is the difference?

Mr. POINDEXTER. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ascertain that it is \$50,000 less than the amount expended this year; but the strength of the Navy and the services to be rendered will be the same. Of course, the saving, if any, will have to be made by an enforced economy in the organization and in the manner in which these services are performed.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, is not the Navy personnel larger to-day than that for which it is proposed to appropriate for the next fiscal year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is just about the same.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no; there are nearly 135,000 men now.

Mr. HALE. The present number is 123,500.

Mr. LENROOT. Then that is more than it is proposed to appropriate for during the next fiscal year, and, therefore, if this has a material bearing on the expense and is unsupported by reason of the personnel, under the Senator's own statement they need less money next year than they had this.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator is speaking about the strength of the Navy at the present time. These appropriations are based upon an estimate of the average strength of the Navy throughout the year, and there is that difference. We do not expect that in the fiscal year for which these appropriations are made the Navy will remain at a fixed strength, in view of the expiration of enlistments and the difficulty of recruiting, any more than it has in the present year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERNALD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I shall have to withhold my vote, not knowing how he would vote if present.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If I were at liberty to vote, I should note "nay." As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

I ask that this announcement of my pair and its transfer may be allowed to stand for the day.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a pair for this evening on certain questions with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]; but I am at liberty to vote on this amendment, and I will therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer the pair that I have with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FERNALD. I find that I can transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I ask if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. LODGE. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I rise to ask if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 11, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ball	Kendrick	Phipps	Spencer
Calder	Keyes	Poinexter	Sutherland
Dillingham	Knox	Reed	Townsend
Fernald	Lodge	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
France	McKellar	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Simmons	Warren
Gay	Moses	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Gooding	Myers	Smith, S. C.	
Hale	Overman	Smoot	

NAYS—11.

Borah	Dial	Lenroot	Thomas
Capper	Kenyon	Norris	Willis
Curtis	King	Pomerene	

NOT VOTING—47.

Ashurst	Gore	Kirby	Ransdell
Beckham	Gronna	La Follette	Sherman
Brandegge	Harris	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Heflin	Nelson	Stanley
Culbertson	Henderson	New	Sterling
Cummings	Hitchcock	Newberry	Swanson
Edge	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Trammell
Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Wadsworth
Fall	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Watson
Gerry	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Williams
Glass	Kellogg	Pittman	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

CREDITS UNDER LIBERTY LOAN ACTS.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to report a resolution from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just to report it?

Mr. CALDER. And ask for its consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I shall have to object to that.

Mr. CALDER. It will not lead to any discussion. It is a unanimous report from the committee, and simply authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct hearings.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What committee is it?

Mr. REED. The Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If that is the matter in which the Senator from Missouri is interested, I have no objection to that. I understand that it will lead to no debate at all.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate resolution 471, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct hearings, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The reading clerk read Senate resolution 471, reported by Mr. REED from the Committee on the Judiciary, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any subcommittee thereof be authorized to investigate and ascertain what credits have been established and what commitments, advancements, and payments have been made or are claimed to have been made by authority of the four Liberty loan acts, the Victory loan act, or any other acts of Congress granting the Secretary of the Treasury authority to accept the obligations of foreign Governments for moneys, munitions, or supplies furnished them by the United States Government and the reasons for making said credits, commitments, advancements, or payments, and

That the committee or any subcommittee thereof may sit during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, or during the recesses between the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-seventh Congresses, and

That the committee or any subcommittee thereof be authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost of not to exceed \$1.25 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with this investigation; and

That the expenses contracted thereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning on page 4, line 11.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 4, line 17, after the word "Navy," to insert "and for such purposes as he may deem proper," so as to read:

Contingent, Navy: For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, \$50,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to make any objection to this, but is this a usual clause in an appropriation bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has always been in the bill—at least, for a number of years.

Mr. BORAH. I see that it was not in the House text.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was stricken out of the House bill on a point of order under the new rule of procedure they have there, where there was a difference between the members of the Naval Affairs Committee and the members of the Appropriations Committee. Simply for the purpose of showing the effect of that new rule several items were stricken out of this bill on which the Appropriations Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee were agreed; but, because a Member made the point of order, they were stricken out.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that it was in the appropriation bill for the Navy Department last year; but is there usually found in appropriation bills a clause authorizing the heads of departments to spend money in any way that they want to?

Mr. POINDEXTER. This particular clause is intended to vest discretion in the head of the department in connection with the specific purposes which are mentioned. The entire amount is comparatively small.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There are some small items, of course, that he has to meet out of this appropriation for the various objects which are specified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire whether amendments to the text are permitted now under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only committee amendments are in order now. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 5, line 9, after the numerals "1921," to insert "and to continue the construction of rigid dirigible"; and in line 10 to strike out "\$440,000" and insert "\$1,440,000," so as to read:

Aviation, Navy: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, as follows: For aircraft and accessories in course of construction or manufacture on June 30, 1921, and to continue the construction of rigid dirigible, \$1,440,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon that amendment I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, in view of the rather lamentable experience of other nations that have tried these rigid dirigibles, and in view of the development of the airplane, whether he regards it as wise to continue an appropriation for that purpose? I ask in the utmost good faith, because I will say frankly that a number of men who I think not only claim to know but actually do know have represented to me that this is an absolute waste of money; that the experience of other nations, of Germany and our allies, with respect to these rigid dirigibles ought to forbid us from expending further moneys for experiments of that character.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, of course there are some differences of opinion about this matter, I assume, just as there are in regard to other branches of the naval service. This increase in the appropriations is to enable the Navy Department to continue the construction of one dirigible, which is now about half completed, at Lakehurst, N. J. The information that I have is not altogether to the effect that the Senator from Utah speaks of. I think that dirigibles have been put into considerable use in Europe, even for commercial purposes, quite recently, and the immediate situation we are confronted with as to this item is that we are engaged in the construction of this dirigible, and the appropriation is for the purpose of completing it, or continuing its construction.

Mr. KING. I was not challenging the advantages and utility of dirigibles for possible commercial purposes, but my criticism was leveled against their utility as instrumentalities of war. Scientific men of character and standing have communicated to me and with me, and their representations are unanimous that as an instrument of war it is an absolute failure; that with the aircraft, the scouting planes, as well as the other forms, the dirigible becomes a target of such magnitude that it is impossible to escape, and to claim for it any advantage for military purposes is absolutely at variance with the facts. I have no expert knowledge. All I know is what I read in reference to the matter, and what I am told by those who claim to know. It does seem to me, Mr. President, that this is a waste of money, and I was appealing to the Senator to ascertain whether or not, with his larger experience and broader knowledge, he would dissent from the view which I have expressed, and consent to eliminate this item.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Utah really would seriously urge the abandonment of this dirigible. We have only two in the entire Navy. One was bought from Great Britain, and we have recently sent a crew to bring it to this country, and we are constructing this one, and are now in the middle of its construction, having expended a million dollars on it, and in view of the opinion of the aviation officers as to the usefulness and value of dirigibles, and also the experience of the Germans—of course it would take a long time to discuss the details of the use of the Zeppelins during the Great War, but they were a considerable feature of the German offensive during that war—I do not think the Senator would object to completing the construction of this one dirigible.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object if the Senator in charge of the bill feels that it ought to be completed. But I do want to say, if the Senator will pardon me, that this is an exhibition of the reactionary and archaic policy which has been announced by the General Naval Board, a policy which Admiral Sims, in his testimony before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, characterized as rather of that description.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not like to have the Senator leave an impression, which I know he does not intend to convey, that Admiral Sims spoke about dirigibles.

Mr. KING. No; I was speaking about the general policy. That matter was not called to the attention of Admiral Sims, so far as I know. But he was speaking of the general policy of the board and the report made by the board in response to the resolution which was offered by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What Admiral Sims urged was to increase our general development of aircraft, and what he rather discouraged was reliance upon battleships, although he did not advise the continuance of the battleship construction.

Mr. KING. So that I may do no injustice to Admiral Sims I want to put into the RECORD just exactly what he did say. He stated:

I think the report is very largely mistaken. It looks to me very much like a report the arguments of which are drawn up to prove what they originally believed. It looks to me like a document of that kind. As I stated informally a little while ago, so conservative are military people in their attitude toward new incidents that that is the first development we always have.

I think, Mr. President, that the criticism of Admiral Sims with reference to the policy of the General Board would apply to the recommendation of the General Board for the continuance of appropriations for rigid dirigibles for war purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, line 10, under the item for "Aviation, Navy," to strike out "\$40,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,440,000," so as to read:

and to continue the construction of rigid dirigibles, \$1,440,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand that this paragraph on which we are working now covers the entire question of the aircraft as provided for in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It does.

Mr. BORAH. Increasing the appropriation about \$11,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I am very much in favor, so far as I am concerned, of increasing the aircraft, but I notice below, at the foot of the page, that there is a vast amount of the money to be used for building new buildings and improvements, air stations, and so forth. Those are all amendments which were put in by the Senate Committee. Were they stricken out in the House under the same circumstances?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; the circumstances in regard to those were that it was regarded apparently by the appropriations committee as being subject to a point of order, and they were provided for in a bill favorably reported by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, which was on the House Calendar, but not in this bill which came from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KING. I had some conversation with a member of the Naval Affairs Committee—perhaps the Senator from Washington may have been advised—with respect to one or two items embraced in this appropriation bill and also the item of \$1,500,000 for Alameda.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What was the first item the Senator mentioned?

Mr. KING. Perhaps the Senator was advised of some informal talk which I had with one member of the committee respecting one or two items embraced in this aggregate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator mean the aggregate for aviation?

Mr. KING. Yes; and some aviation bases on the Pacific coast, and in connection with those items the question of the \$1,500,000 for Alameda was considered.

In that informal conversation I made certain statements, and I would like to have this amendment go over until we reach the Alameda amendment, and if what I stated to the member of the committee shall be agreeable to the Senator, then we can simply recur to this, and I shall have no objection to its being adopted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Which amendment is it the Senator asks to go over?

Mr. KING. The items under aviation generally.

Mr. POINDEXTER. All the items under the head of aviation?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well; I will agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment relating to aviation being passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 15, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the word "and," before Corpus Christi, in line 11 of section 1 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, be stricken out, and following the words "Corpus Christi," in the same line, insert the words "Tampa, Fla., and Portland, Me."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 8, after the word "seamen" to insert "and applicants for enlistment"; so as to read:

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

Transportation and recruiting: For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof.

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 2, to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$4,500,000" as the total under "Bureau of Navigation."

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Wisconsin, I think, wanted to be present when this is considered. I ask that it be passed over for just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 2, to insert:

The Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department, is hereby directed to furnish to the proper officers in the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, on or before December 31, 1921, statements of the services of all persons from those several places who served in the Navy during the war with Germany, and for that purpose an additional sum not to exceed \$100,000 is hereby appropriated for obtaining the necessary material and the employment of the necessary clerical force.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Washington whether, with the very large clerical force which has been provided for the Navy Department, it is deemed necessary to allow a hundred thousand dollars additional?

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is not additional. This is an entirely different service, specified in the paragraph. The Senator has read the paragraph and understands what it is for. It is for supplying "to the proper officers in the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia, on or before December 31, 1921, statements of the services of all persons from those several places who served in the Navy during the war with Germany."

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, I entirely approve of the plan to furnish the information which the amendment contemplates shall be furnished.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The word "additional" there is not necessary. The previous appropriation was for the preceding year. This is to continue this work, which was not completed. The money that has heretofore been appropriated for the previous year has been expended. It is not a permanent service, the Senator will understand. The paragraph provides for its completion December 31, 1921. It has been in progress, however, for some time. There was an appropriation made in the bill which passed last year. That has been expended, and it is proposed now to continue and complete the work.

Mr. KING. The inquiry I made was this: A very liberal allowance has been made for the Navy Department. I was wondering if, with the large personnel which has been furnished the Navy Department for its clerical work and the work of a clerical nature which comes properly under the cognizance of the Navy Department, sufficient provision was not made to do the work so as to avoid the necessity of employing additional men. If the Senator after investigation feels that the amount we have allowed to the Navy Department is inadequate or insufficient to perform the work, then I am in favor of it, but it seems to me we have made such a large appropriation for the Navy Department that it ought, with its large personnel, to perform the work.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Utah, but the appropriations for clerical services in the Navy Department are all based upon estimates and testimony as to the cost of the services of the regular organization. This is a special service outside of the permanent organization of the Navy Department, and the sufficiency of the appropriation to which the Senator refers and which he says is liberal, but which was \$2,000,000 less than asked for by the department, was supposed to be entirely used for the purpose of the regular organization of the department, and consequently there would be nothing for this special work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may we now recur to the item on page 9, line 2?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will recur to the item mentioned, and the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, line 2, strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,500,000."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, this item is dependent to a very large extent upon the size of the enlisted personnel of the Navy, and that question therefore comes up indirectly at least at this point, because if we are to have a personnel of 100,000, such as is provided by the House, it would be admitted that there would be perhaps no increase necessary, and certainly not so large an increase as is proposed by the committee, which is \$1,000,000.

In this connection we have heard a great deal about the carrying out of the 1916 program. Some Senators seem to think that program was divinely inspired; that there can be or should be no change whatever with respect to it. But it is a little curious that whenever the carrying out of the 1916 program involves more money and more expense they appeal to it, but whenever the carrying out of the 1916 program involves less expense than is proposed by the committee, we hear nothing of the 1916 program.

What is the 1916 program, and what was it with respect to personnel of the Navy? The figures were given when the 1916 program was adopted, that with every ship constructed and in commission under that program it would require only 96,775 men. They now say 100,000 are not sufficient, when the 1916 program, in so far as new ships are concerned, has scarcely begun, with only one or two ships in commission under it. The authorized strength of the Navy, it is true, is 143,000 men. We now have in the Navy about 128,000 men. The pending bill appropriates for 120,000 men throughout the year, and I have no doubt that many Senators assume from that fact that it is proposed during the next fiscal year to hold the enlisted personnel of the Navy down to 120,000. However, that is not true at all. Under the appropriations that are proposed by the Senate committee the enlisted personnel of the Navy at the end of the next fiscal year will be somewhere between 130,000 and 140,000 instead of 120,000. With reference to the Army we have appropriated for an average of 175,000 throughout the year, and that will bring the Army down to 162,000 at the end of the year. But it so happens here, where Senators would naturally think the same rule would prevail, that appropriating for 120,000 throughout the year will bring the Navy very nearly to its full authorized strength at the end of the year.

What reason is there for that expense? Does any Senator believe for a moment that there is the slightest possibility that during the fiscal year beginning on the 1st day of next July our Navy will be called into action with any first-class power in the world? No Senator on this floor believes it. I can not believe that there is a Senator on the floor who believes that there is even a possibility of the Navy being called into action with a first-class power during the next fiscal year. I can well understand the attitude of those Senators who believe the Navy should be kept up to its full fighting strength at all times, so that in the future we shall be ready whenever the time may come, although we may be certain it is not within the next year or two years or three years; that the policy should be to keep the Navy up ready to fight at any moment, although during any given fiscal year we may be absolutely certain that there will be no occasion to use it.

Comparisons, so far as personnel is concerned, have been made between our Navy, the British Navy, and the Japanese Navy. The British Navy to-day, large as it is, conceded to be superior to ours in effectiveness, has only 107,000 enlisted men against our 128,000, but it is said the English seaman, the English sailor, the English gunner, has better training, has had longer training than our American boys. Is there a Senator on the floor to-night who would admit or who would make the statement that, although they may not have had so long a training, it takes six American boys to match five English boys? Perhaps there is, but I am not one of them. By the same reasoning Japan to-day has a personnel of 70,000 in her navy. These gentlemen would have the country believe that it takes two American boys in the American Navy to match one Japanese. Does anyone seriously contend that?

I am in favor of keeping up our Navy to a high state of efficiency. I am not in favor of abandoning the 1916 building program. I am in favor of our aviation program as contained in the bill, in so far as especially as research and betterment are concerned, but in view of the condition of the United States Treasury, in view of the certainty that the Navy will not be called into action with any first-class power during the next fiscal year, in view of the need of economy, I do not see how the amendment can be justified that will bring the personnel of the Navy up to over 130,000 at the end of the next fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this item, with the items on pages 30 and 31, are the items that bear directly upon the question of the size of the personnel. I do not desire to be calling

for a quorum every few minutes, but I should like to have a quorum here when we pass upon that very important question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to suggest that if we can pass this particular item until we take up the item on pages 30 and 31 we could possibly get enough Senators here to have a quorum to give consideration to the bill for a few minutes. I ask that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho asks unanimous consent to pass over the pending amendment for the present. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Naval Affairs was, on page 10, line 5, in the item for gunnery and engineering exercises, to strike out "For the maintenance of established shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges, and for transporting equipment to and from ranges, \$100,000," and insert:

Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery, target practice, engineering exercises, and for economy in fuel consumption, to be awarded under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may formulate; for the purpose of printing, recording, classifying, compiling, and publishing the rules and results; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transporting equipment to and from ranges, \$100,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are many provisions in the pending bill which command my approval. I recently presented in a minority report upon the Borah resolution some of my views concerning our naval program and certain international questions cognate thereto, and the views there presented are pertinent to the discussion of the pending measure. Upon a number of occasions I have contended that not only the interests of the United States but of the world required the creation of a vital and functioning international league or association of nations devoted to world peace and world disarmament. It was apparent that a treaty following the armistice and which would impose indemnities and reparations upon the defeated nations would not alone solve all postwar problems or bring full and satisfactory international fellowship and cooperation into the world. Great statesmen, philosophers, humanitarians, and the people throughout the world, horrified by the war experiences of the past and sincerely desiring the dawn of a brighter and sweeter day, asked of their political leaders for some program, some rational plan, that would promote world peace and justice.

This Nation in the World War became the leader not only in material but in moral things. The disinterestedness of the American people, their well-known desire for justice, their unselfish contribution to the World War, gave them a preeminence denied to all others, and so victors and vanquished turned to America for guidance in the dark days that it was recognized would follow when the momentous problems created by the war would call for solution.

As I recall the attitude of our allies and of the world during the peace conference, there was no distrust of our Nation or jealousy because of its primacy. It seemed the natural and proper thing for the peoples everywhere to turn to this mighty Nation for leadership and inspiration. I shall not discuss the causes which prevented the United States from entering the league nor the world-wide disappointment, indeed despair, resulting from our action. I shall not consider what is involved in our abandonment of our allies and our refusal to assume those imperative obligations resulting from the war, affecting not only the peace and welfare of Europe but, indeed, the peace and welfare of the world. I express, however, my profound regret at the course pursued by this Nation, and repeat what I have heretofore declared, that, in my opinion, we have been guilty of punic faith, and history will record that we deserted our allies at a critical period, and refused to accept the opportunity to perform a high service for humanity; a service which would likewise prove of inestimable value to the people of our own land. Refusing to become a member of the League of Nations or to join in the world movement for limitation of armaments, we have retarded world peace and have become an impediment to the realization of a policy for which the world is crying out, a policy of disarmament, which would bring a measure of relief from the staggering burdens of taxation under which the world is now struggling.

Our purposes will be misunderstood, and this misunderstanding will be the basis of demands upon the part of other nations who desire disarmament, for the maintenance of military forces and the building of more powerful navies. Our example in refusing to associate with the world to bring about world peace and world disarmament, followed by a naval program the most pretentious and ambitious ever devised by any nation, will inevitably react upon other nations and produce

disquiet, distrust, and, indeed, animosity, which it may prove difficult for this Nation to allay. When the world is crying out for peace and looking for moral leadership, we demand isolation and project a naval program which will involve in the immediate future the expenditure of more than one billion of dollars. The despairing people of the world cry for bread and we give them a stone.

However, Mr. President, in view of the position which our Nation has taken, I shall support a policy which will give us an adequate Navy. I have outlined in the minority report, to which I have referred, what I conceive to be a suitable and proper naval policy to be pursued.

In the consideration of the pending naval bill I have been impressed with the thought that the overhead expenses of the Navy Department are entirely disproportionate to the amount appropriated for construction purposes and for meeting the compensation allowed officers and enlisted men. The same thought was also suggested to me when we were considering the Army bill. As I recall, the amount appropriated for the Army for the next fiscal year was more than \$400,000,000, yet of that stupendous amount but \$36,000,000 was carried for the compensation of the enlisted men. By far the greater part of this huge sum was for overhead expenses. An examination of the pending naval bill reveals that the amount to be paid to the enlisted men in the Navy is insignificant measured by the total sum asked in the bill.

The bill before us carries approximately \$500,000,000. As I have explained in the minority report, to which I have referred, the completion of the 1916 naval program will involve a further direct expenditure of more than \$500,000,000, and several hundreds of millions more will be required immediately for plane carrier ships, submarines, and so forth, to provide a Navy which is symmetrical and which will be necessary to round out and properly supplement the Navy called for in the 1916 program. And with the completion of this program we will still be called upon to appropriate approximately \$500,000,000 each year for the maintenance of the Navy, and the additional amount that will be required annually for new construction will be enormous, aggregating tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars.

I repeat, the overhead expenses in both the Army and the Navy are too great. There is too much waste and extravagance both in the Army and the Navy. There are too many organizations and agencies, too many plants and machine shops and posts and military and naval stations. There are too many civilian employees and too many officers and men within the military and naval service engaged in insignificant and unimportant duties. The time has arrived to reorganize naval and military administrative methods. Economies must be practiced. Better work must be done. A higher standard of efficiency must be attained. There are needed in the Army and Navy men of executive ability, of courage, of vision, men who live in the present and not in the past, and who will adopt improved business methods and apply high standards of efficiency and service. The war made for extravagance and profligacy in the expenditure of public funds, and radical reforms are imperatively required in the Navy as well as in the Army. I protest against an appropriation of approximately \$500,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy for one year, an insignificant part of which is required to meet the compensation due the enlisted personnel. It seems that the war spirit which developed an appetite for enormous appropriations in all branches of the Government is still controlling us. We are still carried by those giant waves which covered the land and gathered all within their powerful sweep. We seem unable to extricate ourselves from these mighty influences and return to the paths of economy and safety and national sanity.

As I have stated, in view of the attitude of our Nation, I favor a rational, and, if I may be permitted to say, a progressive naval program. I am opposed to an archaic navy; and if we are to have one, I desire that it shall be modern and represent the most valuable and enduring lessons revealed by the Great War through which we have just passed. I am not advocating a "little Navy" or a weak Navy or an obsolete Navy, but an efficient and adequate Navy.

I confess to disappointment at the adoption of a policy which generates international suspicion and may be provocative of war. Without desiring to be critical or partisan, I am constrained to express my regret at the action of the Senate yesterday in halting proceedings during the consideration of the naval bill and entering into an executive session. While the session was presumed to be a secret one, Senators knew that the newspapers of the following day would contain reports, more or less accurate, on the proceedings. It is clear that the situation under which the secret session was called would provoke not only national but international comment and inter-

est. It was known that there was some opposition to the naval bill and to the stupendous appropriations which it carried. It was known that there was a feeling among some people in the United States that there should be a suspension, partial or complete, of the 1916 naval program, pending negotiations not only for disarmament but for a league or association of nations. It was also known that England had suspended the construction of additional capital ships, and that in Japan, outside of what might be denominated the military party, there was an insistent demand that the Japanese people be relieved from further naval burdens. A secret session of the Senate which was considering these enormous appropriations for naval purposes would unquestionably be regarded by other nations with anxiety and suspicion. I believe, Mr. President, that the secret session of the Senate yesterday will be interpreted by Japan and Great Britain, as well as other nations, as a movement, if not in the interest of imperialism on the part of this Republic at least as a veiled threat against one or more nations. I am afraid that nations that desire our friendship and wish to live in amity and peace with the United States will regard not only the secret session of the Senate but this bill as a challenge to the world.

In my opinion it is not the proper time for the United States to wield the "big stick" or announce a policy of jingoism. There should be a subsidence, not a revival, of the war spirit. We should be for world peace and for a reduction of armaments, for fraternity and fellowship. We should breathe the spirit of mercy and charity and love, and seek sincere cooperation, not only with our allies but with all nations to bring about world peace and usher in a new order of social justice and international harmony. Never before has this Nation had an opportunity so great for beneficent and enduring service for civilization and humanity. But there are those in our midst who demand that we shall have the largest Navy in the world; that a plan projected in 1915 which will involve the expenditure for construction purposes of approximately \$1,500,000,000 shall be carried to completion regardless of the teachings of the war or the despairing condition of the world or the psychological effect that such action will produce everywhere. The reactionaries and materialists would strip from our Republic its crown of leadership, its moral habiliments, and return to the old conflicts with their deadly passions and struggles. They seek not only to control our domestic policies but our international policies, and preach the same creed, imperialistic and sinister, the same philosophy of force, which found enthusiastic propagandists in German military and educational circles for more than a quarter of a century preceding the recent war. They refuse to believe that moral progress in the world is possible, or that there can be relief from the military and naval burdens which have oppressed the world. These forces while professing a desire for world peace are insisting that war is imminent, and they are demanding larger appropriations both for the Army and the Navy than were ever granted by Congress except during the two years' participation of this Republic in the recent World War.

When appropriations have been sought for military or naval purposes there have always been the loud cries of the jingoes who have warned of approaching war and appealed to the passions and prejudices and national vanity of the people.

Mr. President, in my opinion the United States should communicate to the nations of the world its purpose to aid in relieving humanity from naval and military burdens. The American people should manifest their faith in God and in His purposes, and seek not only in their domestic but in their foreign relations to exemplify the teachings of the Nazarene whose influences Christian nations recognize and whose principles if sincerely adhered to will establish peace and righteousness and justice throughout the world.

This false philosophy, this crass materialism to which I have referred, would condemn humanity forever to the treadmill of war and preparations for war. Is there to be no amelioration from the tragic conditions that have afflicted the world in the past? Are we forever to tread the pathways which have been macadamized by human bones and cemented with human blood? Is the future to be merely a repetition of the tragedies and sorrows of the past? Is humanity forever to be chained like Prometheus, to be preyed upon by the vultures and the beasts, that a materialistic world from which God and morality are banished will create? Are we to devote our resources and dedicate our energies, our genius, and all that we have to preparations for the destruction of humanity and the devising of means to wage devastating war on land and sea?

A few days ago a distinguished admiral testified before the Senate Naval Committee, and his statement seems to find expression in the naval appropriation bill now before us and to support the jingo policies which are being advocated by some

in our midst. He contended there would be no "cessation of war," and that those who came after us must devote themselves to the construction of battleships and to preparation for war.

Unfortunately Mr. President, some naval and military officers are zealous propagandists of big armies and big navies. They see danger upon land and upon sea and find foes lurking where only friends appear. These officers, as well as many who write upon military and naval questions, adopt the premise that if a nation shall enjoy peace, it must maintain the biggest army and the most powerful navy. Under the guise of preparedness, they inculcate a spirit of war and seek the creation of a military régime. International peace, in their view, is possible only through armaments and military and naval forces. They seem oblivious to the fact that this competitive system of international armament has obtained in the past and has resulted in cruel and devastating wars and in deluging the world with the blood of uncounted millions of human beings. Each nation must arm and the world be converted into an armed camp; thus will peace and righteousness and love and fellowship prevail in the hearts of men. It is a false and wicked philosophy. We have denounced it and its apotheosis in Germany and have accepted the view that the World War resulted from this policy.

I inquire, Mr. President, are we to return to the darkness and the horrors of the past and take Germany's place as the exponent of military power in the world? Are we to cast aside moral leadership for military leadership, and drive the impoverished distracted people of the world back into the shadows from which they have emerged, and force upon them a cruel, oppressive, and reactionary policy, one that makes for war, and war with all its attendant evils?

Returning to the testimony of the admiral, let me read a few of his sentences:

All this talk of disarmament is absolutely and scientifically wrong. It is not in accordance with the teachings of history. It is euphemistic, to start with, and any argument that can be made against unpreparedness can be made against disarmament. Disarmament in a great country always precedes a toboggan slide every time. That is the first symptom.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] after this statement had been made, suggested to the admiral that his position commanded a very able advocate in Bernhardt.

The teachings of Bernhardt, following the materialism of modern German philosophy, are familiar to the American people. He accepted and supplemented the philosophy of Nietzsche, who said:

And you have heard men say, blessed are the peacemakers; but I say unto you, blessed are the war makers, for they shall be called, if not the children of Jehovah, the children of Odin, who is greater than Jehovah.

This view was not confined to the military cabal of the German Government, but it permeated all intellectual circles, controlled the universities and eminent professors whose names were known in other lands, influenced the clergy, and found supporters in all ranks of society. Nietzsche and those who possessed similar views sought to impress their philosophy upon the political leaders of Germany, believing that the ideals and purposes by which they and the military leaders would be guided, would, in the end, determine the thoughts and lives of the people. If the philosophy of force could be made the policy of the Government, it was believed that it would soon shape the conduct and furnish the ideals of all the people.

There can be found historic examples justifying their belief. Often the lives and thoughts of the masses are reflected in the conduct and policies of their political leaders, but in many nations and in various ages those possessing political and military power have molded public thought and established the paths trodden by the people. This barren and destructive philosophy of Germany, which was a negation of the vital and living forces operating in the world, fired the imagination of the German people and filled them with mad ambitions and desires for conquest and world hegemony.

Treitschki was an exponent of the philosophy of force, and he stated that the establishment of an international court of arbitration as a permanent institution is irreconcilable with the nature of the state. "To the end of history, weapons will maintain their right and precisely herein lies the sanctity of war." Another statement by him is the following: "A living God will take care that war shall always return as a terrible medicine for the human race." And again he speaks of the "moral majesty of war."

Von Moltke, guided by the same spirit, in a letter to Bluntschli, wrote: "Perpetual peace is a dream and not even a beautiful dream. War is an element of the order of the world established by God. The most noble virtues of men are developed in it. Without war, the world would stagnate and lose itself in materialism."

Returning to the testimony of the admiral, this question was propounded to him:

So you do not look forward, then, to any decrease whatever in the burdens of the people of the world in maintaining these great armaments? You feel that those have got to be borne and they have got to increase continuously? You do not look for any relief whatever in that direction.

This was the reply of the admiral to that question:

I put it this way: I do not like to appear as a prophet, but will say that according to history that is the way it has always been. If there is anything to change the current history, then, of course, that will have a bearing.

This answer would imply that because history is replete with the record of wars, the future is to be found in the vortex of war; that any efforts to reduce armaments would be unwise and would be conclusive evidence of national decadence and a sure precursor of national death; and further, that bloodshed and international conflicts were to continue forever.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have listened with interest to the extract which the Senator from Utah has read from the testimony of the admiral, and I want to suggest to the Senator if he does not think that the admiral has in mind, when he states the consequences of disarmament, the consequences that would devolve upon a nation which disarmed unless other nations also disarmed?

Mr. KING. No, Mr. President, I do not think that the admiral had that in mind, because at another point in his testimony he said, in substance, that if there were agreements to disarm they would be absolutely ineffective and that nations would continue to arm and war would be the companion of humanity. If not the substance of his statement, that is the legitimate inference to be derived therefrom.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The admiral may have thought that some nations might not keep their agreements, as some nations frequently have not kept their agreements; but I do not deduce from anything the Senator has read the inference that the admiral was in favor of war per se, for the love of war, or that he thought that universal war was a good thing for the people; but that he thought that a nation that disarmed when other nations remained armed was, as the admiral said, "on the toboggan slide"; and I agree with him.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the position of the admiral is not precisely that taken by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. I might add, however, by way of parenthesis, that the argument suggested by the Senator from Connecticut has always been urged by militarists in favor of military preparations and of costly armaments. The Emperor of Germany repeatedly declared that he was the greatest peacemaker in the world and that his purpose was to establish peace; but while avowing his devotion to peace he was building a powerful navy and drilling a mighty army. When his attention was called to the inconsistency between his declarations for peace and his feverish preparations for war he replied that preparedness made for peace and that his policy was to insure against war. Even if it be conceded that he did desire world peace, it is apparent that the very course which he pursued not only was the precursor of war but inevitably would lead to war. The course of Germany inspired fear upon the part of some nations and compelled them to increase their appropriations for military and naval purposes for years preceding the wanton attack of Germany upon France. The French people lived in constant fear of the descending sword of Germany and the marching hosts of the Kaiser's legions. They were compelled to increase their taxes, strengthen their armies, and devote a large part of their resources to defensive military preparations. The efforts of the Czar of Russia to promote international good will and establish international tribunals to settle international controversies met no hearty response from the military leaders of Germany; and accordingly the military burdens of Russia were increased and the Russian people lived in constant fear of Prussian aggression.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield further?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, I am not attempting to defend those who have pretended to be for peace but have really been for war. Here in this bill we are making a proposition to the other two great naval powers to meet for a conference for the purpose of reducing naval armaments. It seems to me that the Senator from Utah is not justified in saying that the admiral from whose testimony he has just read is in favor of this country being at war or being ready to wage war except in so far as is necessary for the defense of the country.

Of course, I admit the Senator has a right to draw his own inferences from the testimony, just as I draw mine, but I assume that an adequate Army and Navy as prescribed in our Constitution mean adequate for the defense of American interests. However, I do not want to vote for and I shall not ever vote for any appropriation which I think is meant for an attack against other nations. I think the whole world recognizes that this Nation has no imperialistic design upon other nations, but that its sole idea, as I think its proper duty, is to have sufficient force in the present condition of the world to protect its own property and its own citizens in their rights.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am in accord with the statement of the Senator, that the United States should maintain an Army and Navy adequate for the defense of American interests. There may be differences, however, as to what constitute an "adequate" Army and an "adequate" Navy for such purposes. There are those in the United States who insist that we require an Army of at least 500,000 men, and there is strong support for the proposition that we should have the largest Navy in the world, in order to protect American interests. Indeed, there are some who insist that our Navy should be as large as the combined navies of Great Britain and Japan. They effect to see dangers to this Republic unless a Navy of that magnitude is maintained by the United States. I desire it to be distinctly understood that I am not arguing against the maintenance of an adequate Navy and an adequate Army. I do protest, however, against the effort to militarize and navalize this Republic. I protest against the mischievous propaganda abroad in the land that the interests of this Nation are imperiled by Japan and Great Britain, that war with one or both of these nations is imminent and that for the protection of American interests we must spend hundreds of millions if not billions annually for war purposes. This talk is midsummer madness. It is fraught with danger. It is an insult to the American people and an affront to the nations of the world. If these views should be crystallized into legislative action, it would inevitably result in deep-seated fear upon the part of other nations as to the purposes of this Republic, and in turn fear would be supplemented by resentment.

The Senator says that the world recognizes that we have no imperialistic designs. I hope that statement is true. I feel sure that the overwhelming majority of the American people have not designs against any other nation, nor do they desire a single foot of soil belonging to any nation under the sun. There are those in the world, however, who read American history somewhat differently from the Senator and myself, and who ascribe to this Republic ambitions for world power, if not for territorial gains. They refer to our conquest of Mexico and the vast territory which came to the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo; nor do they forget to point to the territory acquired under the Treaty of Paris after the Spanish-American War. We acquired the Philippine Archipelago, more than 10,000 miles from our shore, as a result of that war, and we lowered forever the flag of Spain that had floated for centuries over the island of Porto Rico. It is averred by these critics that Cuba is not a free nation, but an appendage to the United States.

Our beneficent purposes in China have been misinterpreted. Because European nations sought to dismember China our appearance in the Orient has been regarded by some as an effort to there secure a sphere of influence incompatible with the freedom and independence of China or to interfere with claims asserted by other nations. Our attitude under the Monroe doctrine has also brought us under suspicion, and some peoples have unfairly attributed to the United States a purpose to control the Latin-American Republics indirectly, if not directly. Of course, these criticisms and suspicions are unfounded. We desire the independence and freedom of all peoples. We welcome into the international arena the smallest nation and rejoice in all movements which emancipate those who have been in bondage and lead humanity to higher levels and to peace and prosperity.

Referring to the testimony of the admiral and the statement of the Senator as to the deductions to be drawn therefrom, I distinctly disavow any purpose to place an interpretation upon his words at variance with that which they clearly imply. But what I was particularly attempting to emphasize was that the admiral seemed to accept the theory that there were not moral forces in the world, nor would there be in the future, nor any other factors—educational, scientific, religious, or social—that would terminate war, but that the future promised unending sanguinary conflicts and that they were as inevitable as the movements of the tides or the coming of the dawn.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the admiral may have been right or wrong about that; I do not know; that is a question of opinion. I do know, however, or I believe, that there is not suf-

ficient moral force in certain nations to keep them from breaking the peace and pursuing their own selfish interests.

I am led to make these observations simply by the fact that I do not think the admiral, whose name I do not remember, if it was mentioned—and I do not care to ask the Senator to mention him—had in his mind anything which justifies the Senator comparing him to the German, Bernhardt, who justified war for war's sake, and who claimed that it was necessary, as I read his writings, for the physical and moral upbuilding of the man. I admit that military and naval training have their athletic value and give a man a setting-up and that sort of thing, but I would not think that even the acquirement of those accomplishments would justify war, and neither do I think that the admiral would. Bernhardt apparently did, but I do not think the Senator ought to compare the testimony of this American admiral with that of the advocate of war in Germany, to whom he has referred.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] desires to interrupt me, and I will now yield to him for that purpose, but will reply to the Senator from Connecticut when the Senator from Missouri has concluded.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I was going to ask a question, which is not apropos of what he is just now saying; but a moment ago he spoke about the admiral apparently not thinking that there was any moral force in the world to restrain men from making war, and I thought the Senator had in mind that there was such a force. I admit its value among advanced peoples, but just what moral force does he think would restrain a Turk? What moral force would restrain the present Government of Russia and lead them to deal justly and equitably with the remainder of the world? While there are nations in the world that disregard moral questions or construe them according to their own interests, what defense is there except the good old defense of being able to take care of yourself? I do not know whether I can treat that as a question, but I have tried to convey an idea.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is a practical man and a practical statesman, and I think he appreciates the limitations of human nature and the weaknesses of humanity, perhaps, as clearly as any man in public life. At the same time the Senator from Missouri, in my opinion, believes that humanity has a brighter day before it than the present or the past, and that the ethical forces in the world are more powerful than ever before, and are operating to bring about a higher civilization and a reign of justice and peace.

Mr. REED. I wish to inquire when that day is going to get here and what is going to happen to us while it is coming?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the practical attitude of my friend toward all questions always reasserts itself, I am afraid sometimes to the submergence of other influences which are controlling in the affairs of men. I am sure the last question which the Senator propounded was not intended by him to mean that humanity is forever condemned to pursue the pathway of travail and bloodshed over which it has traveled in the past and that there are not moral forces sufficiently powerful and enduring to lead mankind to a more perfect state.

My distinguished friend is a Christian and seeks to base his conduct as a neighbor, a citizen, and a statesman upon the precepts and the imperishable beatitudes of the greatest of all men. He so acts because he finds therein the sure foundation upon which individual character rests and civilization and progress abide. A sterile philosophy of negation has brought despair to human hearts and distraction to human endeavors. I submit that there is developing in the hearts of men a profound faith in the mercies and providences and eternal purposes of an Infinite Father, and mankind are seeking with deeper humility and sublimer faith to know the will of God that they may learn of His ways and walk in His paths. They are discovering that there are fountains of celestial and spiritual force which convert the arid wastes of life into fruitful fields and introduce into the lives of individuals and nations higher ideals, more exalted purposes, nobler aspirations, as a result of which both men and nations are being cleansed of their selfish and cruel purposes and are striving to advance the dawn of a better day. This view is not the result of a baseless dream or a groundless faith, but it is becoming a vital force in the lives of the people and a powerful factor in determining their conduct and the conduct of nations. Of course, moral growth and spiritual development, as manifest in the social organism, proceed slowly, and humanity mounts with difficulty the heights crowned with celestial light. But God and nature work ceaselessly and without shadow of turning. The intellectual and moral progress of the world during the past two centuries is so startling as to seem unreal and, indeed, miraculous. As the forces of righteousness increase, reforms and progress move

with greater celerity. Science, reason, religion, and God's revelations to humanity teach the same lesson, preach the same great truths, and prophesy the advent of the day of righteousness.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. REED. But that period, I take it, lies some distance in the future.

Mr. KING. I grant it.

Mr. REED. And I believe in preserving the life of the American Nation in the interval. I can accept the tenets of the Christian religion; but while I believe in God, I believe also in the rest of the maxim, to "keep your powder dry."

I recall the fact that 2,000 years ago there occurred the passion of the crucifixion, and what the Sermon on the Mount has not accomplished in 2,000 years is not going to be brought about by any idle dreams of the dreamers of to-day. The man who fails to recognize the practical side of this question dooms civilization to annihilation and postpones the glorious hour when the sun of the millennium is to kiss the horizon of time and its glory flood the world.

Mr. KING. The Senator has made an eloquent peroration to an eloquent speech.

Mr. REED. A very short speech.

Mr. KING. I will not say that its merit consists in its brevity; but, Mr. President, if I correctly interpret the Senator's position, I do not agree with all the implications arising from his premises. That civilization must be preserved is granted, but if the Senator means that the influences of Christianity have failed to ameliorate conditions in the world, I can not assent to his view. If the Senator means that to preserve civilization we must persist in military armaments, then I am not in full accord with his position. I am afraid when he speaks of "keeping our powder dry" his position will be construed as being in harmony with the attitude of the philosophers of force, who have sought to perpetuate a cruel and despotic militarism. Of course, we must meet the conditions of life in a sane and rational manner. The brutal, uneducated man may not be influenced and governed by the same forces and methods which control the intellectual and moral man. But this question reaches deeper than the statement of the Senator implies. The practical and utilitarian man fails if he does not reckon with the unseen but nevertheless vital currents which determine in the end the fate of men and nations. We may encase ourselves in armor made by human hands and deem ourselves invulnerable to the darts of the visible foe, but there will be an Achilles heel unprotected. All human defenses sooner or later fail. The genius of Napoleon could not save him at Waterloo, and Victor Hugo's prose poem of that mighty battle is impressive of the truth that there is a power greater than man's which shapes the end of all.

Mr. President, I believe in the universality of law, and that there is a moral law which is pervasive in the world and influences not only "advanced people," to use the Senator's expression, but it operates everywhere and in all ages. If we examine the curved line indicating humanity's rise, we sometimes are filled with gloomy forebodings because human progress appears so slow. And yet there is growth and progress and development, and the moral and intellectual accretions of the past become our glorious inheritance, and building upon what the past has accomplished, we can be assured that the future will increase in glory, in righteousness, and in those sweet and ennobling influences which come from God and lead to God. Because there is selfishness and wickedness in the world and peoples turn deaf ears to the inspiration of God, it should bring no discouragement to those who believe in the moral and spiritual values in life; but rather it should intensify their faith in the ultimate triumph of the truth and increase their devotion to the cause of righteousness and to the service of humanity. The debris gathering in the sluggish streams of life and impeding human progress, should be removed by those nations and peoples who carry the standard of justice. The arid wastes where wrong persists should be fructified by noble deeds and high and pure example. If the Turks and the Russians fail to keep step with the marching forces of progress, they must become the objects of solicitude and sincere regard. The conduct of the progressive nations must be purged of selfishness and vanity and pride, and a truly altruistic spirit must be exhibited by them. Such an example will add to the moral reservoir of the world and the water of righteousness will flow beyond the confines of that reservoir until all peoples will be baptized in its redemptive spirit.

I concede all the implications which may legitimately follow from the inquiry propounded by the able Senator from Missouri. I concede that the Turks have been guilty of atrocities which have horrified civilized peoples. I concede that Lenin and Trotsky have established a military despotism in Russia and that under their cruel régime murder and rapine and cruelties which defy description have been perpetrated. I grant that appeals now made to the Ottoman Turks and to the bolshevist commissars and rulers would make but slight impression. But with these concessions, Mr. President, it does not in my opinion justify all the deductions drawn by the Senator, nor successfully controvert the position for which I am contending. A proper regard for the spiritual and moral factors in the world does not require abstinence from those imperative requirements which self-protection demand. The highest conceptions of justice do not require submission to injustice, nor do they demand the eradication from the human heart of those high and manly attributes, the existence of which are contributing causes to man's moral advancement.

No one is demanding that this Nation shall not protect itself, or that it shall adopt a foreign policy pusillanimous and imbecile. But there is a broad distinction between a policy which visualizes the spirit of justice and adopts a course which is virtuous and manly, and one which proclaims the philosophy of force and seeks to build individual and national character as well as individual and national conduct upon a degrading materialism reflected in selfishness and aggression and devotion to military trappings and power.

Our country is not menaced. Its rightful authority in the world is not challenged. Its flag is respected throughout the world and its citizens are confronted by no nations who threaten their personal or property rights. There is a wide distinction between that attitude which adopts legitimate and proper means for self-protection and seeks to promote the peace of the world and that posture which creates apprehensions and fear throughout the world and leads by example and precept to crushing military preparations and war psychology.

The Senator asks what shall be done pending the arrival of that brighter day which will bring happiness and peace to the world. Mr. President, there is but one course open to the righteous man and to the nation seeking justice, and that is to do right and earnestly seek for the regeneration of others. We should, as Peter says, continue "looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God." I often think of those sublime words of Sir Oliver Lodge, who states that "by faith we may feel ourselves citizens of an eternal and glorious cosmogony of mutual help and cooperation, advancing from lowly stages to ever higher states of happy activity, world without end."

What we shall do in the meantime is answered by President Faunce, of Brown University: "The good man of the fifteenth century was Thomas à Kempis, whose 'Imitation of Christ' has no faintest allusion to any wrongs in this world to be righted. The good man of Bunyan's dream was one who thrust his fingers into his ears to stop the cry of wife and children while he started on his long flight through the world to the celestial gate. But the good man of our time is the one who turns back into the city of destruction and resolves never to leave it until he has transformed some portion of it at least into the enduring city of God."

This Nation is as a city set upon a hill, and its light can not be hid. It should be the leader in every movement conducing to man's advancement. Unselfishly it should strive for world peace and for the spread of those civilizing forces which so copiously abound in life. Our example should be for peace, not war, for confidence and amity, and not suspicion and distrust. We should realize that we are trustees under God, and that we must administer the trust in the interest of humanity. And this high commission will not destroy nationality or love of country or devotion to the flag. The highest love of family increases the capacity of man for service to his country, and the highest patriotism is compatible with love of all peoples. We are heirs of the riches of the past and hold in trust this great patrimony which must not only be preserved but transmitted to those who follow. We in America will add to this inheritance by greater service and higher devotion to the cause of humanity. The Neolithic Age possessed neolithic men, but humanity has traveled far since then.

The Senator speaks of Russia. Mr. President, I have heretofore expressed my views of the Russian people. I regard the Slav race as one of the powerful races in the world. The future has in store rich gifts for it. The Russian people will emerge from the tragic conditions which now oppress them and meet the responsibilities which rest upon progressive Christian peoples. No race will respond more readily to ethical and spiritual influences than the Slavs. Bolshevism is an

ugly parasite which will soon be cast off, and the Russian people, strong and virile, emancipated from the degrading conditions of the present, will take their place by the side of this Republic and other progressive nations and aid in the support of the standard of justice under which humanity will march into broader fields and wider experiences. These bloody chapters will be closed. The Russian people will write a new page in the great volume of Russia's national and international life.

And shall it be said that progress and moral advancement are denied to the Turks? True, their record is dark and sordid, but they possess splendid qualities and have exhibited traits of character calling for the admiration of their Christian associates. It may not be inappropriate to suggest that the dealings of Christian peoples with the Turks have not always been honorable or exemplary. Christian nations have intrigued with them and taught them intrigues. Christian statesmen have practiced subtleties and deceptions in their international relations with Turkey. I make no apologies for the Turkish nation and denounce the inhuman deeds which have characterized its national life. The Great War has brought new conditions to the Turks and they will, I believe, prove amenable to the civilizing agencies operating throughout the world.

Reforms are not wrought in a day or in a generation. Progress is not an exotic plant, but it is nevertheless an enduring one. We conquer evils and grow stronger by the victories gained. Emerson refers to the legend among the Hawaiian people who believe that the spirit of the vanquished foe takes possession of the victor, strengthening him for future contests. And so individuals and nations rise upon the "stepping stones of their dead selves to higher things." "Forward" is nature's watchword. It is God's command. And to go forward in the true sense means progress in the vital and enduring phases of life.

Physical power and martial greatness do not promise victory or enduring success. It is the moral, the spiritual, the divine "imponderables" which survive and which are the vital factors determining man's progress. The bloody pages of the past and the revolting records of humanity do not disturb my faith in the future. I have an abiding faith in the moral forces of the universe and affirm that they are operating in the hearts of men, in the social and political organisms under which we live, and these forces extending with the years will so powerfully influence the lives of men that ultimately the dreams and prophecies of prophets and poets and sages will be realized. The day of peace will dawn and righteousness will cover the earth as the waters cover the mighty deep.

But I do not wish, in anything that I have said, to be understood as advocating the destruction of our Navy. While I am pleading for world peace and for our Nation to lead the way for international amity and fellowship, I am not advocating that we make no military or naval preparations. Indeed, in the report which I submitted a few days ago I recommended the completion of six great battleships now in course of construction. I also recommended the construction of a battle cruiser, the cost of which will be approximately \$50,000,000, and when completed will be the most powerful ship that will ride the waters of the deep. Later in the debate I may discuss the present status of our Navy and the kind of a Navy which we should maintain. So, Mr. President, if the Senator is proceeding upon the assumption that I am opposed to a Navy of adequate proportions for national defense, he misconceives my position. I should welcome an agreement between the nations for the restriction of naval and military armaments and regret that the United States has thus far failed to cooperate with the great powers for the purpose of limiting armaments and hastening world peace. But I have felt that if we should announce a militaristic policy, following our protestations of devotion to world peace, our sincerity would be questioned by other nations and our course would be provocative of increased military and naval preparations upon their part. I have believed and still believe that our Nation occupies a position in the world where its example will be controlling among the nations. If we declare for peace and for a limitation of armaments; if we, in good faith, associate with the nations to establish an international court, and to reduce, if not abolish, naval and military armaments, and to promote international peace and amity, it will restore hope to a distracted world and bring joy and, indeed, gratitude to millions who are now struggling beneath burdens which are almost beyond human endurance. I believe that we can reclaim our lost leadership, and that all nations will joyfully follow our footsteps.

When interrupted by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Connecticut, I was discussing what I conceived to be the materialistic attitude of one of the leading admirals of our Navy. I called attention to his statement that to talk of

disarmament was wrong and would produce national retrogression. The Senator from Connecticut has indicated that I linked the admiral with Bernhardt. I read the statement of the admiral and called attention to the statement made by the Senator from Montana to the effect that the sentiments expressed by the admiral "would command a very able advocate in Bernhardt." I agree with the Senator from Montana that the position of the admiral was precisely the one assumed by Bernhardt and Nietzsche and other German writers who lead the German people from the paths of peace to the heights of militarism, and from which they set out to dominate and control the world.

While I am referring to the testimony of the admiral, let me proceed a little further and call attention to other statements made by him at the same time.

The question was then asked:

So you don't look forward then to any decrease whatever in the burdens of the peoples of the world of maintaining these great armaments; you feel that those have got to be borne and they have got to be increased continuously; you do not look for any relief whatever in that direction?

In reply to that question the admiral made this statement:

I will put it this way—I do not like to appear as a prophet, but will say that according to history that is the way it has always been. If there is anything to change the current of history, then, of course, that will have a bearing.

Then he said that he did not believe that a reduction of armaments was possible, even "though nations should enter into agreements to that effect, because the agreement would not last very long." Then he added that it might last 20 years.

The following question was then propounded to the admiral:

If wars have existed from the dawn of history while governments have been armed, don't you think if they fail to arm, or if they reduce their armaments, or enter into an agreement for disarmament, that it might result in a cessation of war?

This reply was made:

No; I am absolutely sure, as far as I can be sure of anything in the future, and I am only basing it upon 5,000 years of history, and that is a good deal.

Then these questions were asked:

Q. In short you find no chances to escape from the burden of competitive armament?—A. I would like to see the burden made as light as possible, Senator, but I do not see on looking at it in the light of history, and the way in which we are going now; competition among the people and the tendency of overseas trade—there is hope for cessation of war.

Q. If you think that an agreement for the reduction of armaments would be entirely ineffective, you must equally agree that an agreement for the purpose of not increasing armaments—that is, holding them stable—would be equally ineffective. Am I right?—A. I am afraid it would be ineffective.

Q. So that the necessary conclusion at which we must arrive is that there is no possible escape from the burden of competitive armaments, and you can see no relief whatever in any line from the rivalry in which we are now engaged.—A. I am sorry to say it, but I think so.

Q. And that would mean that we have to continue our naval and military burdens indefinitely?—A. I think so.

Mr. President, I do not recall ever having read, in such bold and striking language, the proposition, hideous and ugly in its nakedness, that there is no relief from the burdens of naval and military armaments which now press upon the world, and under which humanity has struggled during the thousands of years of recorded history. I repudiate that doctrine. If I believed, as the admiral has expressed himself, I would sympathize somewhat with Huxley, when he said that if social and economic conditions were to continue unchanged he would hail, as a consummation devoutly to be wished, the advent of some friendly comet that would hurl this little world of ours into destruction.

The admiral has stated, Mr. President, that there is to be no "cessation of war"; there will be no relief from the burdens of war; that we are to tread the winepress of agony and bloodshed and sorrow to the end of time, using the genius with which we may be inspired to devise more powerful weapons for the destruction of humanity. We are not to build for the spiritual and moral development of humanity, but we are to dedicate ourselves to the policies of war, and preparations for war, for the purpose of continuing war.

Of course, it will be urged that preparations for war do not mean war or a continuance of war. Yet, Mr. President, whenever nations have armed, and have followed a policy of militarism, they have ultimately engaged in war. The argument which the able Senator from Missouri made is substantially the argument which is made by those who are the most earnest devotees of strong armies and big navies.

I have referred to the philosophy of force which led to the Great War. Mommsen, the historian, predicted what the result of such philosophy would be. He stated:

That there should be a care lest in this country, which has at once the power in arms and power in intelligence, the intelligence should vanish and nothing but the pure military state should remain.

It has been claimed by some that Admiral Mahan strengthened the hands of the disciples of militarism. Without arguing that

matter I desire to call attention to a few sentences from his work. He states that "the armaments of the European States now are not so much for protection against conquest as to secure to themselves the utmost possible share of the unexploited or imperfectly exploited regions of the world—the outlying markets or storehouses of raw material, which, under national control, shall minister to national emoluments." This is a defense of his thesis that the causes of war are economic and material, and is in contrast with his statement of the purpose of armament in his article entitled "The folly of The Hague," where he contends that armament is the beneficent power which protects the quiet and the weak. These are his words:

Armament is the organization and consecration of force as a factor in the maintenance of justice, order, and peace. It is the highest expression of that element in civilization—force—which has created and now upholds society, giving efficacy to the pronouncements of law, whether by the legislature or in the courts. Organized force, alone, enables the quiet and the weak to go about their business and to sleep securely, safe from the assaults of violence without or within.

It is believed that the author refers to police force in his defense of armament as the consecration of force in the maintenance of justice, order, and peace. Armament, however, goes beyond that field and is devoted usually to defense and attack.

The advocates of militarism have supported their views by appeals to biology as well as sociology. They have mouthed the words "survival of the fittest" and "natural selection," and have sought to apply to political institutions and to governments the theory that the strong nations alone should survive and that all governmental policies should be directed in conformity to that view and that big armies and strong navies were essential to achieve the desired ends. During the war we heard no defense of the German philosophy of force and no claim that the alleged theories of biological development should find complete duplication in social and political activities, but there now seems to be a recrudescence of teachings we then condemned and policies which met with reprobation, and efforts are being made by some to apply the principles of true philosophy and the expositions of Darwin and other biologists to the conduct of nations. These efforts are insidiously made and find support in some circles. I protest against the perversion of the philosophy of Darwin and of other great biologists and sociologists to the support of a brutal materialistic creed and a destructive militaristic policy.

The true Darwinian theory is that social progress depends not upon "force and collective homicide, but upon institutions and ideas." Darwin's position is that the most noble attribute of man is the moral sense of conscience. While he attributes this as a development from the social instincts, there are others who postulate a divine manifestation. Darwin's thesis is that the social instincts are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the evolution of a moral sense. The view of many Christian theologians accounts for the moral sense as a direct manifestation of the mercy and power and goodness of an everlasting Father. There is a practical scientific view which contemplates the extension of those social instincts and sympathies highly developed until they become the determining fountains of human conduct and will ultimately culminate in a federation of the world nations and peoples bound by the moral law. Darwin sought to find the cause of civilization's advance "in the social habits of man in cooperation and mutual aid for the struggle against the physical universe and in the moral law." Indeed, both Darwin and Wallace believed that the chief cause of social progress and human evolution is to be found in ethical factors. Even Huxley insists that social progress means a "checking of the cosmic processes and the substitution of the ethical processes," which means in the end the survival of those who are ethically the best. Huxley further states that the purpose of that which is "ethically best—that which we call goodness or virtue—involves a course of conduct which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence." He insists that in place of "ruthless self-assertion" there must be self-restraint; instead of the destruction of competitors, that there shall be respect and help, and that its influence shall be directed rather to fitting as "many as possible to survive," instead of in behalf of the "survival of the fittest." The gladiatorial theory of existence is repudiated and the laws of moral precepts directed toward curbing the cosmic process and reminding individuals of their duties to the community. And, finally, Mr. Huxley says: "Let us understand once for all that the ethical progress of society depends not upon imitating the cosmic processes, still less in running away from it, but in combating it."

Both Wallace and Huxley emphasize the break between the cosmic processes of human society and attempt to bridge the gap between the ethical man and the natural man, and the

former seems to feel "the need of *deus ex machina*" to solve the problem. But Darwin, "with no discontinuity finds the development in the moral law as a part of the great sweep of the cosmic principle," and this moral law he regards as the instrumentality which will bring human society toward a perfected state.

In analyzing the causes why one nation rises and makes progress more rapidly than others, he assigns as important reasons "the number of the men endowed with high intellectual and moral faculties as well as their stand of excellence."

There are some who support the position of Mr. Kidd as defined in his work, *Social Evolution*. He contends that there is antagonism between a large class of individual conduct and the interest of the social organism, and demands the submergence of individual interest in the interest of the mass. He finds no rational sanction for such action, and accordingly postulates an ultrarational sanction which he conceives to be the basis of religious belief. I submit that his hypothesis that there is antagonism between the individual and society is not sound. The highest interest of the individual finds expression in the highest development and welfare of the social organism itself.

Lord Bryce, in an address on April 3, 1913, as president of the International Congress of Historical Studies, emphasizes, in principle at least, Kant's theory of "universal history as the growth of a world community," reconciling the freedom of individuals and of individual States and the accomplishments for the common aim of mankind as a whole. The developments of science have had a binding influence upon peoples and nations and have brought into apposition, if not integration, peoples differing ethnically and between whom in the past strong antipathies have existed. Mr. Bryce states:

The world is becoming one in an altogether new sense. * * * More than four centuries ago the discovery of America marked the first step in the process by which the European races have now gained dominion over nearly the whole earth. * * * As the earth has been narrowed through the new forces science has placed at our disposal * * * the movements of politics, of economics, and of thought in each of its regions become more closely interwoven. * * * Whatever happens in any part of the globe has now a significance for every other part. World history is tending to become one history. * * * The widening of the field is also due to a larger conception of history, which (through the aid of archaeology) now enables us faintly to discern the outlines of a process of slow and sometimes interrupted development of mankind in the Old World during a period each one of the divisions of which is larger than all the time that has elapsed since our first historical records begin.

Humanity has grown in knowledge, in power, in social unity, and in effective organization, all of which tend to the acceleration of progress and a higher standard of civilization. We are learning the art of living together in close relation, which, as Henry George says, constitutes civilization, and nations are being drawn toward each other under compulsions not of force but of knowledge and social unity. Gregariousness does not stop with boundary lines, and so peoples of different nations and, indeed, of different races are coming together in the interest of peace and justice as well as for the promotion of self-interest.

I referred to science as a unifying and civilizing force. The demonstration of this thesis is unnecessary, because it is obvious to all. And the language of the poet is addressed to humanity. Knowledge is a solvent, and removes antipathies and racial prejudices and brings convincing proof of the solidarity of the human race and of the truth that the interest of one is the interest of all. When Darwin speaks all nations give ear, and the voice of preacher or prophet or teacher, no matter the country from which it comes, rings around the world, and the speaker becomes a world citizen.

Cosmopolitanism results from knowledge, and a corroding selfishness yields when closer contacts result between individuals, communities, and nations. It was Mazzini who said: "Thank God, the philosophy of Cain has passed out of this world forever. We are our brother's keepers." No longer do civilized people close their eyes to world conditions, and the cry of distress in the remotest part of the world finds a ready response. There is an effort to apply in international affairs and relations the principle which John Hay denominated as "the golden rule and the open door." Men everywhere are beginning to realize that they are trustees and their trust is a sacred and divine one. They are heirs of the riches of the past, but hold in trust this great patrimony which must not only be preserved but enlarged and transmitted to those who follow, beautified and augmented by service.

This is the age of science and literature and art, of religion and morals, and it is preserving the moral man. As humanity has developed, the sense of clan division has yielded to that of the guild, to the sense of class, and finally to that of national self-conscience, and the latter condition has been modified by

softening influences and spiritual concepts so that nations now feel that they are a part of a great body of humanity and that bonds of internationalism encircle the peoples of all lands. The conglomeration of tribal forms yielded to national organizations through gradual development, and there is developed a unity based on pure culture. The road before us is still long and it is beset by dangers which imperil the advancing hosts throughout the world, but there are always those who see the summit above gild, by the light of God, and with courage they climb the dangerous and rugged heights, while below the masses, often with indifference, watch the retreating forms who seek to lift humanity to higher levels. But the call of these inspired ones gives courage to those behind, and so humanity marches ceaselessly forward.

Neither individual nor nation has reached or will reach perfection. There will be struggles and problems which will develop character and produce higher standards of moral excellence. Some of Rodin's immortal productions depict figures puissant and mighty emerging from the rough-hewn marble blocks. So humanity, still bound to the past but growing more beautiful as the years go by, is seen emerging from old conditions and assuming nobler proportions and possessing increasing moral and spiritual power.

Sophocles states that man with his boundless skill "moves on; sometimes evil and then again to good." He perceives the collective power of humanity and the combining forces of knowledge and social unity. Shelley stressed the power of collective human thought not only in penetrating the secrets of the universe, but in conquering evils and effectuating world fellowship.

It was Whittier who perceived the purposes of God for humanity's welfare in the development of electricity, and wrote these beautiful words:

Weave on sweet shuttle of the world,
Beneath the sea so far
The bridal robe of earth's accord
The funeral shroud of war.

It was Emerson who said: The arch-abolitionist older than John Brown, and older than the Shenandoah mountains, is Love, whose other name is Justice, which was before Alfred, before Lycurgus, before slavery, and will be after it.

And Kant declared that he adored two wonders—the stars above and the moral law within. Men are beginning to appreciate more and more that there is "an increasing purpose" running through the ages, and they are seeking to learn that purpose and to submit to those laws of union which are operative in the material as well as in the moral world.

Mr. President, the purpose of life is service and the canons of conduct prescribed in the teachings of Christ are based upon a true philosophy. If individual or nation would advance and achieve true happiness, they will find the royal road in service and sacrifice and loyal devotion to others. The compensations that flow from such conduct are beyond computation. Not only material compensation follows for their enrichment, but the moral power which becomes their portion brings to them enduring and eternal life. The lessons of the greatest teachers revolve around this great truth. The beatitudes are not concerned about conquest and power or self-aggrandizement or national authority. They glorify conduct guided by charity and mercy and purity. When we learn that there is an infinite force and power, perhaps indefinable, underlying human conduct and all the things of life, which operate ceaselessly for the triumph of those principles of justice, love, and mercy and righteousness which the utilitarian and the cynic often deny, life will take on a higher meaning and there will dawn that brighter day of which I spoke in answer to the suggestions of the Senator from Missouri. And this view is not Utopian or visionary, but it is founded upon the realst conception of life and upon the soundest experiences of individuals and nations. But speaking of Utopia, I am reminded of a statement by an English writer who came to a tragic end. He said: "A map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which humanity is always landing. And when humanity lands there, it looks out, and, seeing a better country, sets sail. Progress is the realization of Utopias."

Even Ibsen, whose pessimism seems to many a dominant note in his works, declared that "what is wanted is a revolution of the spirit of man"; and later he said: "I am also an optimist, for I firmly believe in the power of those ideals to propagate and develop."

I recall having read an address by W. W. Campbell of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered in 1915. He there stated: "That which is purely practical, containing no element of idealism, may sustain existence and to that extent be valuable, but it does not civilize. I believe it is

the idealism of pure knowledge, the idealism in applied knowledge, the idealism in industry and commerce, the idealism in literature and art, the idealism in personal religion, which leavens the life of the world and pushes forward the boundaries of civilization."

I am contending for no policy that would weaken nationalism or create an international government. I am seeking only to emphasize the fact that we must have ideals and appreciate the interdependence of States and nations, and earnestly strive for those international bonds of union and fellowship that will tend to the abolition of war and the devotion of the energies of the peoples everywhere to the arts of peace and genuine and enduring progress. I am complaining of the persistent efforts of some to perpetuate the war spirit and to sow the seeds of discord between this Nation and other nations.

Let me inquire, Mr. President, whether, since the armistice, our example has been such as to be promotive of world peace. We sent our boys across the seas to defend civilization and, if possible, to end wars. Mothers with profound sorrow in their hearts gave their sons, many of whom made sacrifice of their lives upon the blood-stained fields of Europe, because they believed that their blood would rouse throughout the world a new spirit for liberty, for justice, and for peace; and that following the World War there would be a world baptism which would endow the nations with higher purposes and divine inspiration. Two years have passed since the armistice and it is felt by some that we have not realized all for which we struggled and are not guided by that spiritual light to which our sacrifices entitle us. Is there a reversion to the old spirit? Are the moral values which we appraised to be lost? Is there a manifestation of atavism resurgent with us and in the world? I will not believe, Mr. President, that the moral victories gained will be lost. Undoubtedly there will be here and there a recrudescence of the old philosophy of force and the spirit of hate and national antipathies; but that very fact implies an obligation upon those who believe in the moral and spiritual attributes of the universe and in the controlling power of God, to greater service and higher devotion to the social and moral welfare of the world.

But we are told that Great Britain has a powerful navy and that Japan is strengthening her naval power, and therefore we must maintain the greatest Navy in the world. I regret that we did not become a member of the League of Nations, so that in cooperation with those nations and other members of the league a program for disarmament could have been adopted. Such a course would have removed suspicion and jealousies which are productive of war, relieve the people from pressing burdens of taxation, and hasten the advent of international peace. In my opinion, if the United States had joined the league and had adopted, in connection with the league, a policy for disarmament as therein provided, there would have been reflected in the national conduct of every nation in the world the spirit of that policy and we would not be called upon to follow a naval program which will impose upon the United States a burden of at least \$1,500,000,000 within the next two or three years, to be followed by annual expenditures of approximately \$500,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy and needed naval developments.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt his very able speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. There were recently presented to the American people two alternatives, to wit, to enter the League of Nations and assist other nations in preserving the peace and bringing about reduction in naval and military armament or to reject the League of Nations and continue to protect our possessions and our coasts by our own Navy, as we have done in the past. It would seem that the American people having decided not to avail themselves of the opportunity for such armament reduction as the league would have afforded, and having decided by a majority that can not be gainsaid to preserve the peace of their own country by their own strong arm, that as sensible and patriotic men we must protect ourselves as we have done in the past, since we are not in the congress of nations. I wish to have the Senator's view on that point. Shall we say we decline to go into the League of Nations, and then require our citizens, their lives and property, to be exposed to those brutal and ferocious assaults that all wise statesmen know frequently imperil civilization? Innocence alone in national life is not a sufficient guaranty of safety. Serbia, Belgium, and France learned that.

We sinned away our day of grace when we refused to join other nations in reducing armament. What is left to us but to

have a Navy to protect our 11,000 miles of seacoasts, our far-flung islands of the Pacific, our Alaskan possessions, our newly acquired islands in the West Indies, our Panama Canal, the key of our commerce in two oceans? We must approach the situation in a practical way. We are not to be in the League of Nations; ergo, we must have a Navy.

It was sea power that saved Rome from Greece; sea power saved Greece from Persia; sea power gave the Phenicians command of the ancient maritime world; sea power built up the commercial empire of Carthage; it made Athens ruler of vast territories and made Rome empress of the earth. Sea power once gave the Moslem domination from Constantinople to Cordova. When Spain had great sea power she dominated Christendom and brought home the dazzling riches of Mexico and Peru, and her decline began when storms and British seamanship wrecked her great armada. The sea power of France turned the scales in our favor in our American Revolution. In the War between the States here it was the sea power of the North which enabled her to fling a line of 1,200 ships around the Confederate coasts and finally to overwhelm the Confederacy. In the World War, notwithstanding the superb valor of those who fought so bravely on land, it was sea power that transported the American soldier to Europe.

Call the roll of all the nations that have risen in the past; they rose when they had sea power. Call the roll of those nations that now are a schoolboy's tale and whose temples and palaces are inhabited by bats and owls; they fell when they permitted their sea power to weaken.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Arizona always illuminates by his generalizations and incisive statements and remarks—

Mr. ASHURST. Before the Senator proceeds, permit me to thank him for the opportunity granted by him to make this statement.

Mr. KING. I was about to say that the Senator from Arizona illuminates subjects discussed by Senators and makes contributions to matters under consideration by the Senate. With part of his argument I agree, but many of the premises which he assumes I deny; nor do I follow all the deductions which he is pleased to make from his assumed premises. It might be stated in passing that his arguments are similar to those which justify great military and naval armaments. Most nations when they build stupendous navies or maintain large armies profess the highest altruism. They contend that they are merely "insurers of peace" and have no aggressive purpose or imperialistic design. Napoleon's prodigious military operations were always for peace and defense.

It is impossible in the time at my disposal to review the historic examples that support what I have stated and negative many of the statements made and deductions drawn by the Senator from Arizona. But first let me reply to the statement made by the Senator that the people at the last election decided against entering the League of Nations or against the policy of assisting nations to preserve the peace and bring about a reduction in naval and military armaments. On the 28th of January of this year I discussed the reasons which contributed to the Democratic defeat and analyzed the position now taken by the Senator from Arizona. I then contended that the American people had not decided against the league or against an international agreement for the reduction of armaments and for the purpose of securing the material benefits to be derived from an association or League of Nations. I called attention to the fact that there were many factors entering into the contest which were more determinative of the results than the question of an international association. I referred to the fact that the Republican platform, as well as the statements of the Republican candidate for the Presidency, were construed by the overwhelming majority of the American people as being favorable to an agreement between the United States and the members of the League of Nations for the establishment of an international court and securing a reduction of armaments and in order that there might be closer and more friendly relations between all nations of the earth. Indeed, it was stated by ex-President Taft and Mr. Hoover and leading Republicans that only by the election of Senator Harding could the United States be brought into the League of Nations. The American people desired world peace and believed in the efficacy of the League of Nations to bring about that result. Many desired reservations to be attached to our ratification of the covenant of the league. Still others believed that no modification in the provisions should be made. But those who opposed any sort of an agreement between the United States and the other nations of the world to secure world peace and a limitation of armaments and to create international tribunals and organizations to settle international controversies and execute international obligations, were insignificant in numbers and powerless to secure the adoption of their views.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator from Utah be kind enough to allow me to inject another sentence into my interruption? A Senator near me has suggested that in our War of 1812 we won but few battles on land except the great battle which Andrew Jackson won at New Orleans. It was the sea power that brought victory to the United States in that war. My friend, the Senator from Utah, who has enriched the annals of the Senate this afternoon and yesterday afternoon with his splendid speeches, overlooks the fact that national safety may lie in sea power; and that while militarism, indeed, overthrows the liberties of the people, there is not a line in the histories asserting that naval power overthrows the liberties of the people. It sustains those liberties. Naval power is a moving, pulsing line of leviathans that protects and defends a country the while the civilians within that line pursue the arts of peace.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when interrupted in order that the Senator might make an addendum to his speech I was referring to his interpretation of the results of the last election. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that many who supported Senator Harding approved of the policies of President Wilson but believed that as the Senate was constituted it would be impossible to secure the ratification of the Versailles treaty in its present form, and they felt that Republican success would permit a modification of the treaty, not important enough to defeat its purpose, and that with such modifications the United States would enter the League of Nations. In the campaign the most reactionary Republicans did not oppose an agreement between the United States and other nations for disarmament and in the interest of world peace.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I recall seeing in the newspapers what purported to be a quotation from the lips of the distinguished governor of Massachusetts, who is soon to adorn the Presiding Officer's chair in this body, to the effect that in his judgment the American people had not in the last election repudiated the League of Nations. There are many of that opinion, especially in view of much of the talk that was had by the Republican candidate for President, and those who entertain that opinion, of course, agree somewhat with the view expressed by the Senator and have a right to look forward to something in the way of a substitute for armament, under the coming administration, to observe the world peace.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I have not any doubt there are some people who do not know this case has been tried and a verdict rendered and judgment entered. I have never yet seen a man convicted in court who did not think the jury was misled and who did not entertain a faint hope of success on another trial. The man who can not be convinced by a 7,000,000 verdict may have to be convinced by some more verdicts of that kind. Speaking as a Democrat I do not desire to go to trial again on the issue on which we went to trial this last time. It is an uncomfortable majority, not to say merely a decided one.

I do not care what any one man says in regard to it, I remember that the gentleman referred to made some statements during the campaign which indicated he was out of line with the candidate for President. I also remember that it created considerable consternation in the Republican camp. After the bosses got through dealing with the question, I did not hear any more such utterances from that distinguished gentleman until after the votes were counted. It may now be again safe for him to talk.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not fully agree with my friend the Senator from Missouri that the case has gone to judgment and that there has been a decision opposed to the principles and spirit of the covenant of the League of Nations. It may be that an issue was tried and a verdict rendered, but I still insist that the American people by their vote, notwithstanding the decisive majority in favor of the Republican candidates, did not decree that there should be no arrangement or agreement or understanding, whatever it may be denominated, between the United States and other nations for the purpose of limiting armaments, military and naval, and for the purpose of establishing international tribunals to which appeals might be made for the settlement of controversies arising among nations. It is my deliberate judgment that a majority of the American

people to-day are anxious for the peace of the world; they desire no national isolation; they realize that this Republic is and must continue to be the dominant force and power for good in the world and that its influence for domestic peace and prosperity and for world peace and progress can best be exerted through genuine and hearty cooperation between it and the other nations of the world.

In my opinion the American people would welcome an agreement between this Nation and the members of the League of Nations having for its object the carrying out of the greater part of the provisions of the league and of the Versailles treaty. They realize that our peace and prosperity are inseparably connected with the peace and prosperity of other nations, and they will demand, in my judgment, a liberal progressive foreign policy which will place the United States in the vanguard of progress and in harmonious relations, the result of agreements and clearly defined and specified cooperative efforts, with all important nations of the world. This means no supergovernment nor a remission of our sovereignty or the establishment of a disintegrating internationalism.

I recall the statement of the Vice President elect to which the Senator from Delaware has just referred, and it confirms the statement which I was making that in the campaign leading Republicans proclaimed their devotion to the spirit and principles of the league and to the importance of an agreement for world peace between the allied nations and other peoples.

Returning to the statement made by the Senator from Arizona. The Republicans conducted a most subtle and intriguing campaign. In most parts of the United States the campaign was conducted upon the theory that the Democrats sought to create a supernation, whereas the Republicans desired all the benefits of arbitration, conciliation, and international union, including disarmament, but would preserve unimpaired the national sovereignty and power of the United States. In other words, they advocated a league of nations under which would be secured substantially the benefits and advantages which would admittedly flow from the League of Nations.

In those sections, and they were few, in which there was hostility to any international agreement, the views of the distinguished Senators from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and California [Mr. JOHNSON] were emphasized. In those States, in which there were a large number of American citizens of Irish descent, frenzied appeals were made to them to support the Republican Party because it would aid in the liberation of Ireland from British control and would present a frowning front to Great Britain's alleged imperialistic ambitions. Racial prejudices and antipathies were played upon and every possible effort made to create political groups along racial and ethnic lines. American interests and American questions were obscured in the unfair and sinister appeals to race prejudice and antipathies. The Italians were urged to support the Republican ticket because of the alleged opposition of President Wilson to the legitimate aspirations of the Italian people. Nothing was said about the broad sympathies of President Wilson for Italy and the gratitude felt by the American people for the great contributions of Italy to the cause of civilization. Nothing was said of the splendid work by President Wilson at the peace conference in behalf of Italy. And the most wicked and unfair appeals were made to American citizens of German ancestry. The claim was made that if the Republicans triumphed this Nation not only would not enter the League of Nations but would destroy the league and rewrite the treaty of Versailles. Germany was to be relieved of the indemnities and conditions provided in the Versailles treaty, and the United States was to enter into a union or an alliance with Germany under which the two nations would become the dominating force in the world. Every possible effort was made to create prejudices against Great Britain and Japan and to lead the minds of the people from the vital and imperative questions before them for determination.

Mr. President, there was no trial. It was a mistrial. There has been no judgment rendered upon the vital and living questions now before the American people. I repeat that the great majority of the American people are not the disciples of force and militarism; nor are they for a brutal and aggressive navalism or a narrow, provincial, isolated international policy. They know that this Nation is ordained of God to be a light in the world and to wear in these dark hours and in the coming years the scepter of moral and spiritual leadership in all the world.

The Senator from Arizona, as I interpreted his position, insists that the electors of this Republic not only decided against the League of Nations but against any effort to secure world disarmament. I am sorry the Senator has left, because I want to reply to this statement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Utah would not do the Senator from Arizona an injustice. The Senator from Arizona did not leave, but is still in the Chamber.

Mr. KING. I apologize. I did not observe the Senator. I discover, however, that he is temporarily seated upon the Republican side.

I repeat, Mr. President, that in my opinion the American people, if a referendum were now taken, would record their verdict in favor of a limitation of armaments. They are opposed to this Nation becoming a military power or a naval power and of reflecting the imperialistic ambitions that have found expression in Germany and in other aggressive nations. I deny that the American people decided against a limitation of armament or in opposition to efforts to secure world disarmament. Republican Senators within the past 24 hours have voted in this Chamber for negotiations to secure a limitation in war preparations. Why? Because they appreciate the fact that the American people and the people of the world desire peace and full opportunity to return unmolested and unafraid to the tolls and labors and responsibilities which their citizenship and their places in the world devolve upon them. The Senator from Arizona, as I understand him, takes the position that the election constituted a mandate that we should arm to the teeth and have the biggest navy in the world.

Mr. ASHURST rose.

Mr. KING. If I do not interpret the Senator aright, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I know the Senator is incapable of willfully misrepresenting my attitude, and I am anxious that if he quotes my remarks or deigns to pay any attention to them he shall do so from the viewpoint held by me. It is useless to try to enumerate the various reasons assigned for defeat last November, but I believe that all candid men, as the Senator from Utah is candid, will agree that the disasters we met came to us, in large measure, by reason of the covenant of the League of Nations; and I was a Senator who voted for the covenant of the league, and have no apologies to make for that vote. The defeat which came to the Democratic Party in my State was because of the covenant of the League of Nations, and I believe that is true as to the States of New York and Ohio, and I will tell you why.

There was no flaw in the record of the Democratic Party, so far as its internal policies were concerned. No party ever did more utilitarian work. No party in the history of our country ever did more to bring zest, grace, and usefulness into the common life of our people than did Woodrow Wilson, and I believe that those who are capable of correctly interpreting events will ultimately say that it was the covenant of the League of Nations that hurled the Democratic Party to defeat.

I am neither a militarist nor a jingoist—I simply say that having rejected the covenant of the League of Nations, it seems to me we are bound to carry out the naval policy which we adopted in 1916. A Democratic Congress adopted the policy of 1916, and a Democratic President approved it, and Congress went so far as to do the unusual thing of incorporating in the naval appropriation bill arguments therein—a rare thing in American legislative annals. And now, since we are not to enter the League of Nations, it seems to me we must carry out our naval policy which we heretofore adopted, and it calls for such war craft as are necessary to a modern Navy.

No one deploras more than I the necessity for naval expenditures. No one deploras more than I the necessity for military expenditures, but such expenditures are necessary in spite of my deploring.

Evil in this world sometimes must be conquered by superior force, and evil powers that assail civilization must be overthrown either by one forward-looking nation acting alone or by the various nations acting together. Surely he could be convicted of political strabismus who would say now, in the face of the last election, that the American people desire to enter the League of Nations. Having rejected the League of Nations, I fail to perceive what we can do other than to carry out the naval policy we adopted in 1916.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not think I misapprehended the position of my friend, and if I misstated it, of course I apologize to him.

The Senator, as I understand, takes the view that we must carry out a naval policy which was devised and recommended, not in 1916, as the Senator says, but in 1915; and, to recur to what he said a moment ago, I interpret his remarks as meaning that the election was a mandate that we should pursue the same national and international policy in the future as that which guided us prior to our entrance into the Great War. In other words, his position is that the war has taught us nothing; that we are to walk in the same pathway now and in the future as in the past; we are to employ the same weapons, possess the same ambitions, be guided by the same aspirations, and be governed by the same military policies as before. We are to take up

the threads of our national and individual life at the same point where we stood when we were called to war in April, 1917; we must go back, turn the leaves of the record of years of sacrifice and service, and enter upon the same plans that were drawn in prewar times, regardless of the lessons and experience of the war.

Mr. ASHURST. What would the Senator have us do, since we are not in the league?

Mr. KING. That is a pertinent question, one which can not be answered in a word. I should like to first reply to other points made by the Senator; but though a departure from my purpose now, in order to answer the Senator's question, will give my remarks the appearance of hopeless discontinuity, I shall attempt to answer him. First, we should ratify the Versailles treaty, excising, if necessary to secure such ratification, the covenant of the League of Nations. By pursuing that course we would put ourselves en rapport with our allies.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me interject—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator says that we should first ratify the treaty of Versailles by taking from its context the covenant of the League of Nations. The Senator knows that that can not be done.

Mr. KING. Oh, well, the Senator is asking me what I think ought to be done. I am telling the Senator now what I think ought to be done.

Mr. ASHURST. I mean, what practical thing, in this situation, should we do?

Mr. KING. That is not impractical. The Versailles treaty contains numerous provisions relating to the settlement of the war, indemnities, reparations, the establishment of a court of arbitration, an acknowledgment of Germany's offenses and her responsibility for the war. It sets up new nations, contains provisions for the payment of indemnity to America, and leaves to the United States the disposition of the six or seven hundred millions of dollars in possession of the Alien Property Custodian. Part I, treating of the League of Nations, while found in the treaty, is not an indispensable part of it. Germany is a party to the treaty but is not a member of the league. There is nothing impractical in our ratifying the treaty, excepting from the act of ratification the provisions relating to the covenant of the League of Nations. We would then be at peace with Germany and in association with our allies and competent to participate in those matters which we deem important for our welfare and for world peace. While not in the league, we would be technically, as well as actually, at peace with Germany, and diplomatic relations could immediately be resumed. Our consular agents could be sent to Germany and Germany's consular agents would come to us. Trade relations would be resumed and the economic conditions in Germany improved. Moreover, such a course would tend to stabilize Europe and unquestionably would promote the material welfare of all Europe as well as the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. I agree with all the Senator says and devoutly wish it could be done; but the Senator must know, for I certainly know, that it will not be done.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, my friend may be a better political prophet than I am, but I can not believe that the Republican Party will miss the opportunity now presented for a settlement of those questions arising out of the war. As I have indicated, the Versailles treaty will not be defeated because we refuse to ratify it. Germany is not a member of the League of Nations, and there is nothing in the treaty or in the provisions of the covenant of the league to prohibit our Government from ratifying the treaty, excepting from the resolution of ratification the part dealing with the league. As Senators know, there are nations within the league who are not parties to the treaty, and, as I have stated, Germany (and the same is true of Austria) is a party to the treaty, but is not a member of the league. Whatever indemnities and advantages the United States claimed as the result of the war are set forth in the Versailles treaty. Germany assumed responsibility for the war and accepted the terms prescribed by the United States and the allied nations as conditions of peace. It would, in my opinion, be of the highest advantage for the United States to immediately ratify the treaty. While I would be glad to have the United States enter the league, with certain reservations, I realize that such a course is not at present possible; but there is every reason why we should ratify the treaty, even though we except the provisions of the league from our act.

I suggest to the Senator from Arizona, and for the consideration of other Senators, the difficulties that will be encountered in attempting to negotiate a separate treaty with Germany. Germany is bound by the terms of the treaty, and the allied

nations will not renounce the obligations assumed by Germany. It has been suggested that we pass a resolution declaring the state of war at an end and immediately resume diplomatic and consular relations with Germany. That course is open to us, but the adoption of it would be unstatesmanlike and bordering upon the realms of absurdity. The practical thing to do, as I have stated, is to ratify the treaty. That will open the way for great changes in Europe and will do much to stabilize conditions and improve our foreign relations and increase our foreign trade and commerce.

I believe the new administration will seek to carry out a foreign policy that will tend to promote world peace and to bring the United States into most cordial relations with our allies, as well as all nations. The President elect is a splendid representative American. He is devoted to our country and desires that the progress of our Nation and of the world shall not be impeded. Judge Hughes, who has been selected for the portfolio of the State Department, commands the confidence of the American people. He is a man of wide experience, of sound judgment, and has demonstrated that he possesses intellectual attainments of a high order. I am sure that he will appreciate the importance of this Nation taking her proper place in the world, and he will seek an early opportunity to convince our allies and the world that this Nation is profoundly interested in the welfare of humanity and desires to cordially cooperate in all movements making for world peace. Moreover, I believe the administration will approach the great powers, if not all nations, with a view to securing a limitation of armaments. This course, Mr. President, is not impracticable. The achievement of what I have indicated is not only feasible, but, in my opinion, can speedily be realized, and this administration in a sane and practical manner, I feel persuaded, will address itself to the realization of the aims which I have so imperfectly outlined.

Certainly, it is not impractical for the United States to enter into agreement with other nations to limit military and naval operations. The Senator knows that European nations are now bending beneath debts aggregating scores of billions of dollars. Relief must be obtained from the burdens which preparations for war entail. France is spending hundreds of millions annually to maintain her army, and Italy is also incurring additional indebtedness in the maintenance of an army whose proportions can not be justified. Japan, with limited resources, can not without the utmost exertions, maintain her present military and naval force, and can not without oppression obtain revenues to build additional battleships and cruisers. The United States is owing more than \$24,000,000,000. Our foreign commerce is declining and our domestic financial situation is precarious. There are financial clouds in the horizon and it is imperative that the threatened storm be averted. It is vital that the burden of taxation be removed; that economies be practiced and that Government expenses be reduced. Notwithstanding these conditions, we are called upon by the Republican Party to appropriate for the coming year approximately \$1,000,000,000 for the Army and Navy. We are also called upon to carry out a naval program formulated in 1915 which already has cost nearly \$500,000,000 and which will unquestionably require from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 for its completion. The Republican Party is also demanding a naval policy which will impose burdens of from \$400,000,000 to \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000 per annum. It is also proposed that we enact what has been called the "bonus" law, the results of which no one can predict.

I stated a few days ago, Mr. President, that within the next 25 years we would be called upon to expend from \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 to meet charges, claims, pensions, and so forth, resulting from the World War, and this amount will be in excess of the \$24,000,000,000 which we are still owing by reason of war expenditures. The Senator from Colorado stated a few days ago that less than 10 per cent of the billions which the Federal Government is collecting from the people is expended for the civil administration of the Government, and that substantially 90 per cent is expended to meet the obligations of the war and charges resulting from the war.

Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator that the American people have decided against a League of Nations or an agreement between the nations, including the United States, to secure world peace and bring about world disarmament. The Republican Party dare not adopt a policy of isolation and nonintercourse with other nations. In my opinion, it will not construe the election as a mandate for continued armament and the assertion of military and naval power. If it does, it will be sternly rebuked by the people and there will come into power those who seek peace and justice and who will strive to initiate a new order and bring about better conditions in the world.

The Senator from Arizona conveys the impression that the advocacy of the limitation of armament or a modification of

the naval program of 1916 means the abolition of the Army and the destruction of the Navy. I apologize for repeating, but I want to again declare that there is no proposition pending having that end in view. I am combating the contention that the American people have declared against cooperation and agreement between the United States and other nations in the interest of peace and arbitration and world disarmament. I am supporting a proposition that looks to the immediate negotiation of a treaty or an agreement, or a league between the United States and our allies and other nations, in the interest of world peace and to secure limitation of military and naval armaments. I favor a modification of the 1916 naval program. The recommendations which I have made involve the completion of six great battleships and one battle cruiser, their aggregate cost being nearly \$350,000,000. My suggestions also called for the construction of one or two great airplane carriers at a cost of approximately \$50,000,000. I have emphasized, if there is to be no agreement between the nations for disarmament, the importance of building naval aircraft and submarines and of responding to the impressive naval lessons taught by the recent war. I voted for an army of 150,000 men for the coming year, notwithstanding that the cost of maintaining this force called for approximately \$400,000,000.

I know that the motives and attitude of those who are speaking for world peace will be misunderstood and that they will bring upon their heads bitter criticism. But, Mr. President, I feel that the forces of reactionism must not grip this Nation or control the international policies of the world. Now, more than ever, not only this Nation but all nations should be guided by the spirit of liberty and justice and fellowship and peace. We need statesmen who are not only practical but statesmen who have vision and whose hearts will respond to the quickening influences of righteousness that abound in the world and whose judgments will be guided by a desire to see social justice established everywhere. The munition makers and the manufacturers of war materials and the international bankers who would profit by international conflicts, and the military and naval braggarts who are guided by the philosophy of might and force instead of right and justice, must not take the reins of authority in this or in other lands and drive the people into fratricidal conflicts and again deluge the world with blood. I think that the Christian statesmen of the world and the liberal thought of the world should be dedicated to the promotion of the peace of the world.

The auspicious beginning of a world union signaled by the treaty of Versailles must not end in tragedy and defeat. A cry should go out from the hearts of the lovers of justice and peace everywhere demanding that political leaders and governmental authorities should cease all intrigues and disputations and, actuated by high resolves and humanitarian impulses, confer together in order that a rational plan may be devised, if one does not exist, under which the aspirations of the people may be realized and the cause of peace be made secure. We are here talking war and not peace and are exhibiting a bellicose attitude inconsistent with our declarations for international fellowship. We convene a secret session of the Senate, and the press and individuals of influence and position permit the impression to arise that we fear war with other nations and must spend a billion dollars for the coming year for military and naval appropriations. Such an attitude will arouse fear and dread and resentment in some parts of the world. Our explanations will be accorded but imperfect consideration, and the purity of our motives and the disinterestedness of our conduct, though proclaimed ever so vociferously, will need further corroborative testimony to find much support throughout the world.

Mr. President, it is a solemn duty resting upon this Republic to immediately take the lead in a movement for world peace and world disarmament. If we shirk it and become a stumbling-block to the realization of peace and all of its concomitant blessings, history will write damning words against us which all the ages can not erase.

Let us be just to the Allies and fair in the judgment which we form respecting other nations of the world. They concede our high motives in entering the war, but there is bewilderment in the minds of the world when they consider our conduct following the armistice. The American people have been foremost in pleading for an international league.

Ex-President Roosevelt in his speech at Christiania, Norway, espoused the cause of a world league; not a league which merely established an international court, but a league of all peoples of the world, one which had for its object the maintenance of the peace of the world. The covenant of the League of Nations was not stronger in its conference of authority upon the league than was the plan formulated in the great address of Mr. Roosevelt. When the peace conference met it was an

almost universal prayer that a plan should be devised the operation of which would limit, if not prevent, wars and bring into harmonious and happy relationship the free peoples of the world.

The frightfulness of the great conflict, the sorrows and the agonies which had swept the world, prostrated humanity and led them to a world-wide faith which called for a new era. The allied nations and nearly every other nation of the world accepted the work of the peace conference. This Nation held aloof, and powerful political elements declared for a severance of all ties between the United States and other nations, and the adoption of a national policy without reference to the league or the conduct of other nations. Then followed the declarations of the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Daniels, that we must build the greatest Navy in the world. With feverish haste we set to work to execute the naval program of 1915 and to construct 11 great battleships, 6 battle cruisers, and other war vessels at a cost of more than \$1,000,000,000. Contracts were hurriedly let to great steel plants and other manufacturing institutions at prices 100 per cent or more in excess of those prevailing in 1915-16.

Public officials and the press discuss the island of Yap and Japanese immigration and urge that the situation is such as to imperatively require the expenditure of hundreds of millions to give us the greatest Navy in the world. The demand is made that we immediately appropriate \$500,000,000 for the maintenance of the Navy and to carry on the program of construction for the current year. I repeat that this condition necessarily will arouse apprehensions in Japan and in other parts of the world. It subjects us to criticism and suspicion, and those who desire our friendship will attribute to the United States sinister designs and the lust for territorial expansion. Central and South America are building no navies. They want peace. Canada desires peace. The 3,000 miles of undefended boundary separating us from that magnificent territory is an argument in favor of peace between this Nation and Canada. Great Britain wants peace. Her people are struggling with forces which threaten her destruction. Oppressed by debt, unable to rally from the exhaustion caused by the war, threatened by economic and industrial ruin, they realize that only along the paths of peace can deliverance be obtained. Where are our foes? Against whom shall we arm, and toward whom shall we lift our mailed fist? Mr. President, we should begin, nationally and internationally, to preserve the fruits of the great conflict from which we have just emerged.

I return to the statements made by the Senator from Arizona when he interrupted me some time ago. As I understand his position, it is substantially the same as that taken by Capt. Mahan in his concededly strong book entitled "Influence of Sea Power on History." That work undoubtedly exercised a profound influence throughout the world. The claim has been made that it became almost a textbook for the Kaiser of Germany and Von Tirpitz and also strengthened the purposes of Great Britain to maintain naval supremacy. It is, of course, presumptuous for me to challenge the statements and deductions of this great naval writer, and yet I am constrained to declare that some of his statements of fact are not accurate, or, rather, all of the facts and circumstances are not indicated. He has traced causal connections where none exist and drawn deductions not warranted by a fuller and more complete knowledge of the circumstances and facts connected with vital issues which he was considering. For instance, in his discussion of the Punic Wars he attributes the triumph of Rome over Carthage to the former's control of the sea. As I recall, his position is that this control prevented Hannibal from landing troops in Italy and compelled him to send his Carthaginian forces to Spain, from which they were forced to march through Gaul under conditions which broke down the morale and, indeed, practically destroyed his army. This course prevented a union of the two Carthaginian armies and led to their defeat. There are many historical facts which controvert Capt. Mahan's position. There are many reasons to support the view that Carthage had sufficient naval strength to have conveyed her military forces either to Sicily or to Italy. There were periods during the Punic wars in which the supremacy of Carthage upon the sea was unquestionable, and during those periods victories were obtained by Roman armies. At the time referred to by Admiral Mahan, which I have just called attention to, the facts are that Carthage made full use of the sea and transported with but slight difficulty supplies and reinforcements to Spain. It is contended by writers that Spain was a military base and that many of the soldiers constituting the Carthaginian armies were obtained there and accordingly Carthage voluntarily chose to advance upon Italy from Spain. I believe that the second Punic war was a military campaign and

that Rome's victories were but incidentally due to her sea power. Moreover, there is much to support the contention that the Carthaginian defeat resulted from the intrigues and dissensions of the Carthaginians and the refusal of the governing authorities to supply Hannibal with needed supplies and reinforcements. There seems to be no doubt but that in the second Punic war Hannibal could have taken Rome if he had received expected siege engines and reinforcements. The jealousy existing at Carthage against him prevented the dispatching from Carthage and from Spain the material and reinforcements which he required. Moreover, Hannibal expected, when entering Italy, to find revolts and receive accretions to his ranks in revolting Provinces. It could with great force be argued that his defeat, and therefore the defeat of Carthage, resulted from the lack of accurate information on his part or an imperfect judgment as to the internal conditions in the northern Provinces of Italy.

The Senator states that sea power saved Rome from Greece. History discloses that Rome conquered Greece, notwithstanding the failure of the Hellenic armies and the naval strength of the Hellenic peoples. There are those who will question the Senator's historical deductions when he avers that the sea power of Greece preserved her from Persia. True, Greece obtained naval victories, but the ultimate triumph of Greece over the Persian Empire are found in a multitude of causes. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to determine the *causae causans* of Grecian victory, or determine what was, as lawyers say, the "proximate" cause. It is claimed by some that the superior military training and the superior bravery and the remarkable military organization of the Hellenic forces brought Persia's destruction. There are some who say that the downfall of Persia began at the Pass of Thermopole. Still others attribute the victory of Greece to her intellectual supremacy and moral strength. The Senator states that sea power gave to the Phœnicians the control of the maritime world. The Phœnicians were a maritime nation and the Mediterranean Sea became to them almost a territorial possession. They founded mighty cities and by their trade and commerce enriched peoples and advanced the cause of civilization. The sea to them provided lanes for commerce, but the great naval power of the Phœnicians did not save their country, and the cities which she founded are now waste places, and, to use the expression of the Senator, "bats and owls inhabit her waste places and destroyed temples."

The philosophy of the Senator, Mr. President, is not invulnerable to attack, and in my opinion contains many fallacies. Many of the examples which he has furnished to support his thesis that naval power means peace and national perpetuity, if not immortality, may be turned against his position if we obtain the historic facts. The Senator has referred to Greece. He will recall that at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War Athens was a maritime State and the leader of a great confederacy. Her sea power was supreme. None challenged it. Corinth, which had been a strong maritime State, was surpassed by Athens in the rivalry which ensued. Sparta was a military State, with but little naval strength. For a number of years success attended the Athenians, but, ultimately, notwithstanding her naval supremacy, and her victories at sea, she was defeated. Undoubtedly the Senator had in mind the Battle of Salamis. That can scarcely be called a sea battle. Indeed, one writer denominates it a "land battle fought on shipboard." Superior naval forces have often been defeated by inferior ones, as superior armies have been defeated by smaller ones.

Notwithstanding the aphorisms of Napoleon and other military leaders about superior numbers, there are elements entering into battles, whether upon land or sea, that often determine the results, elements entirely disconnected from numerical strength. The naval Battle of Naupaktis was won by the Athenians over the Peloponnesians because of the superior tactical skill of Phormio, the Athenian commander. At a time when the Athenians were undisputed masters of the sea they attempted the invasion of Sicily. The Syracusians, with extemporized ships, defeated the invading fleet.

The Senator referred to the Moslem Empire and of the dominion which it exercised from Constantinople to Cordova. The Senator insists that the dominion of this Empire resulted from its sea power. Again, I think the Senator has not fully appraised all the facts which entered into the triumphs of Mohammedanism and the power of the Mohammedan Empire. The greatest battles waged by the disciples of Mohammed were not upon sea but upon land, and their greatest victories, as well as their most crushing defeats, occurred upon land. In seeking to find the causes of Mohammedan successes we must go beyond the mere physical surroundings and what might be called utilitarian elements. There was a religious fanaticism and an ineradicable fatalism which impelled the followers of the Crescent to almost superhuman deeds of valor. Great mili-

tary leaders were developed and armies of enormous size were raised.

In my opinion, it is inaccurate to say that sea power gave the Moslem Empire its extensive dominion. Spain's sea power and the fate of the Spanish Armada have been alluded to by the Senator. In 1588 when the plan to invade Great Britain was fully matured under Santa Cruz, Spain, as I recall, possessed greater naval strength than Great Britain, and if the plan of Santa Cruz had been put into execution at that time perhaps the course of history would have been different. After the death of Santa Cruz a less competent commander took his place. With fewer ships and approximately with one-third of the number of soldiers provided by Santa Cruz he entered upon the great adventure. England had fewer ships than he and but slightly more than one-half the number of men than were commanded by the Spanish admiral. It is not necessary to review the disastrous results of Spain's impolitic, if not to say, criminal undertaking. Her great naval power won her no victory, and humiliation and defeat followed her upon land and upon sea.

Who is wise enough to say what led to the downfall of Spain, or the overthrow of any nation? The many historians who have learnedly written concerning the rise and fall of the Roman Empire differ as to the efficient and proximate cause of her downfall. Some attribute it to paganism; others to unwise colonial policies; others to her moral decadence and the sensual and voluptuous spirit which entered into the lives of the people. Still others attribute it to slavery and to the economic conditions which prevailed. Usury is named by some writers as a contributing cause to national decline. Still others insist that her political institutions were incompatible with progress and proper development. James Anthony Froude attributes Rome's disaster to the profligate and corrupt lives of the people, and states that she was "rotten from the Bosphorus to the pillars of Hercules." Her naval power and her mighty legions did not and could not save her. She had been weighed in the balances and found wanting, and her doom was pronounced by the God of Justice because of her transgressions and her departures from the principles of righteousness and the moral and ethical laws governing individuals as well as the social organism. The lesson must be learned sooner or later that there are forces and influences, which may not be defined or fully comprehended, which are more powerful than big navies or mighty armies, and which vanquish the forces of men and bring to triumphant victory the weak and the humble things of life.

Mr. Fred T. Jane, in his work called "Heresies of Sea Power," admits that sea power is a factor influencing the course of events; but he inquires whether that influence is on a par with and of the same nature as the weather or military equipment; and many other things. He also asks whether sea power is the "sole cause for the success of a nation in a war involving maritime interests, or whether the victorious nation did not succeed merely because it happened to make use of the sea in winning."

I believe that his conclusions are that history will not affirm that the possession of sea power is a guarantee that the nation possessing it will win.

The Senator from Arizona states that if the roll were called it would be found that the nations which have risen in the past did so because of their possession of sea power. I concede that some nations have reached material greatness because of their maritime power. Other have become leaders because of their agricultural or manufacturing developments. Some races out of which nations have grown live upon islands or lands favorable to the development of an ocean-carrying commerce, and they have achieved success and power in the world because of their maritime activity.

Of course, their sea power added to their greatness. They became the carriers of the products and the commodities of their own and other lands and nations; but I submit this furnishes no argument in favor of a proposition that the greatness of a nation rests upon her fighting qualities as a naval power. It would be absurd to say that the health of an individual is determined solely by one organ. The proper functioning of all organs of the body, as well as the existence of many external conditions, are essential to bodily growth and to physical health and strength. One may not say that the flowers bloom and the plants grow as the result of one cause alone. Sunshine and showers and suitable soil—these and other things are necessary for the proper growth and development of the multitudinous products of the vegetable world.

So also with nations; the complexities in national and international life are such as to preclude the adoption of a formula which will insure progress and growth and greatness or produce certain decadence and death.

Many of the nations of antiquity rose to greatness without sea power. One might inquire, though, what is meant by a "great nation"? Measured by the duration of its existence, China is a great nation. Do we mean great in morals, in intellectualism, in art, literature, religious concepts, or in mere fighting qualities? There are nations who have assumed, if not world leadership, high and conspicuous positions in the world, who have not learned the arts of war, but who have, rather, sought the paths of peace, and there have been and are nations concededly great who have had no maritime strength or naval power. Germany was a great nation before she became a naval power. Indeed, there are many who believe that her decadence began when she entered upon a program for world naval supremacy. The progress of the United States since the Civil War in all the things that are the proper indicia of national greatness is without parallel in the history of the world, and yet we had no merchant marine and an insignificant navy. Brazil and Argentina occupy proud positions among the nations of the world. Their extended seacoast has not led them to naval expansion. They are great nations despite their love of peace and their refusal to spend their resources to raise mighty armies and maintain powerful naval fleets. Since Spain abandoned her oppressive naval and military policies and turned her attention to intensive development and to production and trade and commerce she has taken on new life and is recuperating her wasted strength and recovering from her exhausted condition.

We must distinguish between conditions confronting insular nations like Great Britain and Japan and those which great continental nations encounter. Great Britain is dependent upon other countries not only for most of her raw materials but for substantially her entire food supply. Her home market is limited. She must have ships to bring her food and raw materials and vessels to carry her finished products to the remotest parts of the earth. In view of world conditions in the past and, indeed, those which exist to-day Great Britain must maintain an adequate navy. Japan is in much the same condition as Great Britain. She possesses no raw materials and her inhabitants are dependent very largely upon China and other countries for food supplies.

I agree with the Senator that in many instances national safety not only may but actually does lie in sea power. Our Nation must maintain a strong and fighting navy, though we do not need it to the same extent as insular nations, until by international agreement a plan for military and naval reduction shall be adopted.

I do not agree with the Senator's contention that history furnishes no example of naval powers overthrowing the liberties of other people. I find nothing in the psychology of naval preparations to differentiate them from military preparations. Naval preparations may mask imperialistic and aggressive designs as completely as military preparations for warlike operations upon land. Navalism may be as sinister and as wicked as militarism; indeed, militarism embraces navalism. The possession of great battleships and war fleets may inspire the same covetous thoughts and criminal desires for territorial conquest as may result, or have resulted, from the possession of mighty armies and all of the material forces essential for military expeditions. Germany built her great fleet in order that she might overthrow the liberties of other people. Spain's war vessels were used to hold in subjection the Latin American peoples, the Philippine Archipelago, Cuba, and Porto Rico and other peoples and other lands. Napoleon constructed a mighty fleet to aid his military operations and to execute his ambitions to conquer Europe.

Mr. President, history records the fact that many nations have engaged in predatory warfare and sought the subjugation of unoffending peoples through the agency of their fleets and vessels of war. Let us not take the flattering unction to our soul that if nations reduce their armaments they have removed all fear of aggression or the assertion of imperialistic ambitions. Let us not subject ourselves to the charge of insincerity or hypocrisy by announcing a naval policy that calls for the most powerful navy in the world when other nations are seeking a reduction of naval armaments, and then loudly proclaiming that we have a small Army and that our stupendous naval expenditures and preparations are only intended to convince the world of our peaceful purposes and our humanitarian desires.

Mr. President, I have consumed more time than I had intended, but the thoughts suggested by the Senators from Connecticut and Missouri and Arizona have led me into a discussion of many matters—perhaps some foreign to the matter which I arose for the purpose of presenting. But let me say in conclusion that there is no sanctity in a naval program devised and recommended five years ago. No matter how competent naval experts were at that time, and no matter how

perfect the plan appeared then, conditions now are materially different and naval warfare has undergone radical changes and modifications as the result of the experiences of the World War. Let us revise a program conceived five years ago, and which is now manifestly imperfect, and adopt one that meets the present and the immediate future requirements. Let us in the spirit of friendship and genuine fellowship approach the stricken and burdened peoples and nations of the world and agree upon a program for disarmament which will result in lifting from other nations as well as from the people of our own land a portion of the crushing weight under which they struggle.

Mr. President, I have read the testimony in the record so far as any is furnished covering this item. I can find nothing which, in my opinion, justifies the increase. Everything indicates that during the coming year there will be a general reduction in prices of substantially all commodities. It seems to me that those who prepared the estimates for the Navy—and the same may be said of those who submitted other estimates for the executive departments of the Government—failed to take into account the economic conditions in the world, the causes operating to lower prices, and particularly the financial condition of the Government itself, the very heavy burdens of taxation resting upon the people, nor do they seem to regard the diminishing revenues, the bankruptcy of the Treasury, and the prospect of a bond issue at an early date in order to meet the enormous expenditures of the National Government.

Officials of the Government in the executive departments who are called upon to prepare estimates upon which we base our appropriation bills evince a cynicism and callousness with respect to the burdens resting upon the people which to me is astonishing. Knowing that there will be a deficit for the coming fiscal year of more than \$2,000,000,000, they demand appropriations for their departments aggregating an amount that will exceed our total revenues by at least \$4,000,000,000. I appeal to the chairman of the committee to aid in reducing the burdens of taxation and in subtracting from some of these reported appropriations at least a moiety of the amount therein found. The sum of \$850,000 for this item, in my opinion, is entirely too much, but it is only one item out of a multitude.

As I started to say yesterday when we were considering this measure, substantially every item in the bill is increased beyond the amount carried in the House bill. Usually the Senate in a great appropriation bill reports material reductions in many items, but an examination of the pending bill reveals the fact that there has not been a reduction in a single item.

It is possible some item has escaped my attention, but I have looked in vain for some evidence, no matter how slight, of a desire for economy. We have increased every item, and these increases have been of a material character. We have added to the bill more than \$100,000,000, notwithstanding the prodigious grants made by the other branch of Congress. It would seem, Mr. President, that we were blind to the economic and industrial situation of our country and the serious financial condition confronting the American people. It would seem with a reduction in the personnel of the Navy and taking into account the conditions now existing in the United States as well as in the world, there should be not an increase but a reduction in appropriation bills passed by this Congress. The party in power pledged itself to an economic administration. It is violating those pledges and enacting legislation which places increased burdens upon the people.

After somewhat extended hearings the House Naval Affairs Committee reported a bill carrying approximately \$100,000,000 less than the measure now before us. The Senate committee, with but brief hearings, added to the House bill approximately \$100,000,000 more. Mr. President, we should revise the work of the Senate Naval Committee and reduce many of the items therein found. We should compel by limiting appropriations the practice of economy in the Navy Department. Many of the officials, in my opinion, do not comprehend the financial difficulties before the country and are indifferent to the value of money. Nearly \$500,000,000 is too much as an annual maintenance charge for the Navy. Such extravagance can not be defended. We should not permit it.

Reference has been made to Japan's expenditure for the current year. Japan's naval budget did not exceed 246,000,000 yen, or approximately \$123,000,000, and Senators will recall that there is great opposition in Japan to the appropriation of so large a sum. But we are asked to appropriate for the coming year several times as much as that which Japan proposes to appropriate for her naval program.

There seems to be an active campaign being carried on in various parts of our country in favor of a naval program devised five years ago and to commit the United States to a policy

which will cost in the next three years more than two and a quarter billions of dollars. To whip this policy through Congress lurid statements are made concerning the naval program of Great Britain and Japan, and wild and extravagant statements are submitted that our country is in danger and that for protection against the aggressive purposes and designs of these nations we must spend at least a billion dollars immediately for naval construction and from four to five hundred millions annually for a number of years for the maintenance of the Navy.

Mr. McKELLAR. How does it appear as to the appropriations of England for naval purposes?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, Great Britain is not appropriating a single dollar for capital ships; that is, battleships or battle cruisers.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much is England appropriating for her navy?

Mr. KING. Our program prepared in 1915 calls for more than \$1,000,000,000 for construction, and must be supplemented by at least two or three hundred millions more. We are appropriating for capital ships hundreds of millions, while Great Britain is not appropriating a single dollar for that purpose. We are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars for battle cruisers, while Great Britain is scrapping or has scrapped the keels of three battle cruisers. Great Britain discovered, as a result of the experience in the World War, that the present form of capital ship may be impotent as a fighting ship in the future, and, profiting by such experiences, she scrapped three great battle cruisers of the *Hood* type upon which she had expended approximately \$8,000,000. She has not laid the keel of a single battleship since the war and is not expending a single dollar in the construction of battleships or battle cruisers. Notwithstanding Great Britain's course, we feverishly entered upon a construction program devised in 1915, which called for 11 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, and other fighting craft, the cost of which will be more than \$1,000,000,000. Realizing that the program of 1915 is somewhat archaic, and that many naval experts are questioning the wisdom of building more capital ships, our Naval Board has been compelled to recommend the construction of plane carriers and adequate seaplanes and submarines. Because of the war, work upon the program was suspended in part. Notwithstanding such suspension, we have appropriated in execution of the program of 1915-16 nearly \$500,000,000; and it will cost \$500,000,000 more, in my opinion, for its completion, so that the ships that were to cost \$544,000,000 will require substantially \$1,000,000,000 for their construction.

Moreover, Mr. President, it is admitted by the naval officers and experts who are urging the 1916 naval program that it will not supply us with an adequate Navy.

The experiences of the war have shown that the program of 1916 calls for a one-plan Navy, which all must concede is not sufficient at the present time and does not provide a complete and modern Navy. The experiences of the war seem to have taught the General Board of the Navy Department only one lesson: That we ought to go on spending additional amounts for the Navy; that we ought to keep up the capital ships which England is discarding; and then, in addition to that, we ought to appropriate annually, or at least for a number of years, hundreds of millions of dollars for aviation and undersea craft. So we come out of the war with only one lesson taught to us—namely, that whereas before the war we were to rely upon the capital ships, now we must have the capital ship, costing forty or more million dollars for each vessel, and expensive cruisers, each of which will cost \$50,000,000, and in addition undersea craft and aircraft, the cost of which it is impossible to determine.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that Great Britain spent \$765,000,000 last year on her navy.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator that Great Britain spent that much on her navy. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that Great Britain since the armistice has not spent a dollar upon battleships or cruisers. But contrary to her policy, we have gone on and propose to continue building capital ships, the utility of some of which is seriously questioned by naval experts of international standing. As stated, our 1916 program calls for \$1,000,000,000 in capital ships—that is, battleships and cruisers, and a few auxiliary craft.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I will yield in a moment. Great Britain, profiting by the lessons of the Great War, has quit spending money upon capital ships, and what money she is spending aside from maintenance—and it is a limited amount for the current year, let me tell my friend—is being devoted to undersea craft and to airplanes and plane carriers. I am willing to vote for a large appropriation for aircraft and submarines and plane carriers, and also the necessary amount to complete six capital ships. We have enough torpedo boats—300 of the best in the world—and there is no necessity for building any more at present. We should provide a suitable appropriation for undersea craft and for aviation, but we should suspend a part of the program of 1916 so far as it relates to capital ships. Now I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we know that Great Britain spent at least one-third more on her navy last year than we did; we know perfectly well that she is going to spend a great deal more this year than we shall spend; and we know that Japan has very ambitious designs in connection with navy building. In view of these circumstances, would the Senator, before we have an agreement as to disarmament, be willing to let those other nations continue to build up great navies while we stand still? What is his attitude on that subject? Does he want us to stand still while the two other great nations continue to build, or shall we all stop together when we stop?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator had done me the honor to read the minority report presented by me upon the Borah resolution, or if he had listened to what I had to say this afternoon, he would not have propounded either of the questions just submitted, because both were answered. If, however, the Senate will pardon me for detaining them, I will reply to the Senator and try to explain to him the position which I take with respect to these matters.

In the first place, I do not admit his premise. Whatever naval program Japan has, it is, in part, the result of the naval program which we have adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. KING. If I had time, I would read to the Senator from data which I have on my desk supporting what I have said; of course, I could not convert him; he has such an antipathy to Great Britain that it would be impossible, in my opinion, to convince him of the sincerity of the constant avowals of Great Britain for a policy of disarmament, but if I had time—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Let me complete the sentence.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. KING. I would read to the Senator statements which show that the naval policy announced by the United States has reacted upon Japan, as every person of common sense must have realized that it would. When the World War ended Europe was exhausted in a material and financial way, and Japan was suffering from serious financial and economic disturbances. European nations as well as Japan signified a desire for disarmament and joined with President Wilson in an effort to secure the adoption of a league of nations and they planned for the limitation of world armament in the interest of universal peace. The United States professed a sincere desire to reduce armaments and to provide a judicial system for the determination of international controversies. But now, in the face of all our professions of altruism and desire for disarmament, Great Britain and Japan behold our Nation appropriating more for naval preparations than ever before and witness the most feverish efforts to construct the largest and most powerful Navy in the world.

I submit to the Senator that the attitude of the United States can not be very impressive upon other nations, or, rather, it can not be reassuring as to our future intentions. When Japan learns, as she has learned, that Senators have denounced her as a menace to this Nation and to the peace of the world, and when the Japanese people read the war-like and jingo statements made in various parts of our country, and in some of the newspapers of the United States, and when they learn of the declarations made by Americans that war is imminent between the United States and Japan, and, therefore, that this Government must immediately arm for its protection against Japan, and when they further learn that it is claimed by some American people that the only possible foes that the United States has on the sea are Great Britain and Japan, I submit that her statesmen and her people may not be too severely criticized if they adopt a naval policy which may be regarded as necessary for their protection.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I just want to say that the Senator does me a great injustice when he talks of my

antipathy to Great Britain. I am a great admirer of Great Britain; but the fact that I am a great admirer of hers is no reason why I should want her to control the world, by her navy or otherwise. I am one of those who believe in America.

The Senator has misrepresented my position, and I want to explain it.

I believe that we should rather imitate Great Britain in the matter of our national protection and defense. England, we all know, is building a great navy, and we all know that Japan is following in her footsteps as rapidly as possible. I agree entirely with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that it would be well to have naval disarmament. I voted for his resolution on that subject, or, rather, for the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], which was practically identical with it, but I am unwilling to take steps toward disarmament as long as these two nations are continuing to arm. Whenever these other nations get ready to disarm, then I am ready to join them; but as long as I see them building guns I think in self-protection my country ought to build guns, and that is the reason why I am for this Navy.

Let me call the Senator's attention to the situation that exists in France to-day, and let us follow the example of France. She has just gone through a great war with Germany, in which Germany was defeated. Suppose France had absolutely disarmed, as the Senator would now have us do in the Navy, how could she have protected herself against Germany? Germany has told her: what she is willing to pay. How is she going to make her pay? Only because of her great army and navy. She is a prudent nation. She is looking after the interests of France, and we can but admire her; and so it is with our country. As long as these two other nations—rivals of ours in the commercial world; rivals of ours on the sea, the one already having a greater navy than ours—continue to build, who can say it is not a matter of prudence, a matter of self-protection, a matter of common defense that we should build?

I think the Senator is wholly mistaken in his view that we ought to lie down upon our building program now, tuck our tails, and run.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee talks about my having done him an injustice. All I need to do is to invite the attention of the Senate to the statements made by him repeatedly concerning Great Britain. Of course I accept his statement now that he is a great admirer of Great Britain. I confess, however, that if the expressions with which he has favored us in the past in the Senate are an exhibition of his great admiration for Great Britain, I wonder what they would be if he hated Great Britain.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say this, if the Senator will allow me to answer his question—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah further yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. Yes. It was not a question, however.

Mr. McKELLAR. When I see England undertaking to take away American rights, when I see England unfair in her trade relations with this country, I want to say to the Senator that I am on the side of America. When England is undertaking to gobble up the rights of other nations I might side with her sometimes, because we are kin to her; her people are our people; but when she begins to assert not rights but powers over this country, I am unwilling to submit to the assertion of such powers, not because I do not admire England, but because I believe in my own country first.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator's statement now fully confirms what I said. It manifests beyond all shadow of a doubt his supreme admiration for Great Britain. I am not here to defend Great Britain's naval program. She does not need any defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; she seems to have a number of champions about that want us to quit building a navy, and depend upon England to protect us. I am not that kind of an American. The Senator may be if he likes. He may stand on the floor of the Senate and urge that we build no navy, and that England, in her goodness and kindness and generosity, will furnish a navy for our protection. I have heard him argue on this floor that during the war England's navy stood as our protection. I do not want to be put in that humiliating position. I want this country to have a navy that can protect our country, without depending upon England or any other country for protection.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is always a pleasant thing to affirm one's devotion to one's country. If I were unparliamentary, I might say that that was rather a cheap way of demonstrating one's patriotism.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to demonstrate it by my vote right along.

Mr. KING. I would not be unparliamentary; and my friend may say as harsh and as unfair and as wholly undeserved things as he has just uttered, but I entertain for him a friendship that will not be shaken by criticisms which, upon mature reflection, I know he would not offer. However, he does me a very grave injustice in imputing to me a desire to "destroy" the Navy. I suggested at the outset of these remarks, when the Senator interrupted me, that if he had read the minority report which I have filed he would not have asked the questions submitted; and I now state if he had he would not offer the groundless criticisms which have just fallen from his lips.

Mr. President, I am pleading for a Navy—a well-rounded, suitable, adequate, modern Navy. I never have suggested, I never have dreamed of the destruction of the American Navy. I never have said that we should surrender our rights to Great Britain or that she was our sword and our defense. That question never was discussed by me upon the floor of the Senate, and the Senator is entirely mistaken. There is not a syllable in any of my remarks that justify his statement.

However, I am willing to say now that in the beginning of the war Great Britain with her powerful navy and with the brave soldiers which she threw into the war not only constituted a wall of defense to the British Empire but to the cause of the civilization of the world; and I am willing to accord to Great Britain all honor for her heroic efforts and her services in behalf of world freedom. She is entitled to the gratitude of the lovers of liberty everywhere for drawing the sword when Germany invaded Belgium and in casting her lot with France and Russia and with bleeding Belgium in behalf of civilization and to rescue the world from the menace of a military autocracy.

The Senator says that Great Britain is attacking our rights. I leave him and the people of this country, who are fair and dispassionate, to determine that question for themselves. I am making no charges against her nor am I defending her. I am discussing a naval bill, and referred to the naval policy of Great Britain in so far as it was shown in her abandonment of further work upon battleships and battle cruisers. When the war was over she had four battle cruisers upon the stocks. One of them—the *Hood*—of 40,000 tons, was completed. The other three were scrapped, because the British Admiralty reached the conclusion, as I interpret naval literature, that the capital ship of the future will not be the proud battleship or battle cruiser but the airship carrier, and that the naval contests of the future will be rather under sea and in the air than upon the surface of the sea. So Great Britain is building no capital ships. We have to-day battleships that outrank any battleship that Great Britain has, more powerful—I am not referring to battle cruisers like the *Hood* but battleships—more powerful, of greater tonnage, and more effective as engines of destruction and as weapons in naval warfare.

The Senator says I would destroy the Navy. Upon the contrary, while Great Britain is building no capital ships, I have advocated that we complete six great battleships at a cost of forty-five to fifty million dollars each, and I have advocated that we complete one battle cruiser costing the same amount, and that we construct one and perhaps two airplane carriers at a cost of approximately \$52,000,000. I have advocated the construction of larger and better submarines. I have not advocated the construction of additional torpedo-boat destroyers, because we have 300 of the most efficient in the world. I am for a modern Navy. My friend is for an archaic Navy. My friend wants to go back to 1915, and resurrect a program devised then, as was stated by one of the admirals, and recommended then and crystallized into law in August, 1916, and adhere to that program. Great Britain, in the plenitude of her experience, guided by a wise naval policy and by a naval board ripe in experience, is discarding capital ships and putting greater reliance upon airplanes, torpedo-boat destroyers, submarines, mines, gases, and auxiliary craft. I am suggesting that we should consider, in the light of this course, the propriety of modifying the capital ship program of 1915. I am for a better Navy than the Senator from Tennessee desires. He wants an archaic one; I want the one of to-day.

But, Mr. President, beyond and above that, I desire what I know the Senator from Tennessee wants—an international agreement for the limitation of armaments. Both of us voted for the League of Nations. Why? Because we believed in world disarmament and in the establishment of international agencies to promote peace and permit swords to be sheathed and cannons to be destroyed, and to enable humanity to march forward into the light of a better day.

I am still for a League of Nations. I am still for a policy that seeks for a limitation of armament first and disarmament ultimately. I would pursue a course now that would not be regarded as a challenge to other nations for military or naval supremacy. I would pursue a course of conciliation, of amity, of friendliness.

My friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], apparently forgetting the eloquent speeches which he made for the League of Nations, would throw the glove of defiance into the faces of other nations.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. I have to go to a conference, and I have just a word to say in answer to the Senator from Utah. The Senator has said he is for a large Navy.

Mr. KING. No; an adequate and a modern Navy.

Mr. McKellar. He said he was for a larger Navy than I am for. I am for the one proposed by the bill. If the Senator is for a large Navy, or an adequate Navy, he is taking a remarkable way of showing it. He is fighting this bill. This bill has been prepared by the committee and reported out by a majority of the committee, and it seems to me that, inasmuch as in 1916 we, by a bill, provided that the President of the United States should hold conferences with representatives of other nations for the purpose of seeing if we could not disarm, and inasmuch as no other nation has ever met us or has ever approached us on it, and inasmuch as we have already put into this bill an amendment providing that the United States, Great Britain, and Japan shall get together looking to disarmament, it seems to me we have done as much as we should do, and as long as these other nations are continuing to build it seems to me there is but one thing for us to do, and that is to continue with our program.

If the Senator is a friend of the measure, if he believes that we should be adequately defended, I urge him to stop fighting this bill and taking up the time on this bill, but let it pass, so that we may be adequately defended.

I think we ought to pass this bill, and pass it to-night. We ought to go ahead with the work. We are perfectly willing to join these nations whenever they are willing, but if we ever get an agreement out of them it will be because they fear us, and not because they want to do us a favor.

[At this point Mr. KING yielded to Mr. OWEN.]

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] that had it not been for the interruptions of the Senator from Tennessee I would have concluded my remarks within a few moments, but I am now compelled to ask the indulgence of the Senate in order that I may reply to some of the charges made by the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator alleges that I am fighting this bill. As a part of my remarks I ask that the report which I submitted upon the Borah resolution, and which discusses our naval policy, be inserted at the close of my remarks and as a part of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am opposed to some of the provisions of this bill and I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee is wholly unacquainted with many of its provisions. I am opposed to the enormous appropriations for the maintenance of the Navy. I have stated, and repeat, that a wise and economical administration of the Navy Department would not require for the coming year \$500,000,000. It is not fair to charge that Senators are "fighting" the bill because they are seeking to improve it and to secure the adoption of a policy that will secure the best results for the country.

There is no sacredness in the report of the committee. The Senator says that we should pass this bill to-night. That is the difference between the Senator and myself. I am not willing to vote for measures merely because some committee has recommended them. I want to satisfy my own conscience and my own judgment that the measures are right and the policies reflected in them are sound and for the welfare of our country. It is the duty of Senators to familiarize themselves with proposed legislation and to exercise their own judgment with respect thereto. It is particularly important at the present time that appropriation bills should be examined with the utmost care. We are appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars more than we are deriving from our revenues. We are plunging the country into debt and making expenditures with a prodigality that is inconceivable in the light of the economic and industrial conditions of our country.

I conceive it to be my duty to fight bills that I think are wrong, and I shall not be deterred in my opposition to measures because of unjust charges or unfounded criticism. I have repeatedly stated since this bill has been before the Senate,

and I have stated it as clearly as I knew how, in the report which I have just offered, that I was in favor of an agreement between nations for a limitation of armaments, but that in the absence of such agreement I would heartily support a naval program that would provide this Republic with an adequate modern navy.

In the report which I have submitted I recommended a scientific, modern, fighting, efficient navy. The recommendations submitted involve an expenditure of between \$400,000,000 and \$500,000,000. When completed we would have the most efficient Navy in the world. Japan's naval power would not be more than 50 per cent of that which we would enjoy.

In the face of these recommendations, the Senator says that I seek to destroy the Navy, and he intimates that I am championing the cause of some other nation and have favored a policy of permitting Great Britain to protect the United States. The statements of the Senator are so unfair and so unfounded as to do an injustice to his own virtues and his sense of right and fair play. The Senator says that he "believes in America"; the implication is that because I do not support this bill in all of its particulars that I do not. It is not necessary to reply to this innuendo. It is easy to declare one's patriotism to his country. I feel sure that I am best serving my country in pursuing the course which I am advocating. The Senator would swallow without any change whatever an antiquated program and a policy condemned by some of the greatest naval experts in the world.

The pending bill carries into effect a program devised five years ago. We have learned much since then in naval warfare. The 1915 program paid but scant attention to submarines and seemed to be utterly oblivious to the importance of fighting air machines. The Senator is perhaps unaware of the fact that some of the greatest naval experts, since the lessons of the war have been made known, have declared that the capital ship of the future is not the battleship or the battle cruiser, which constitute the body of the 1915 naval program, but the fast plane carrier that conveys airships over the seas and contains decks and mechanism permitting their being launched into the air, there to do deadly and destructive work against foes either upon land or upon sea. The Senator and others ignore the lessons of the war, close their eyes to the experiences through which the warring nations have just passed, and propose to execute an obsolete plan without modification, at a cost of a billion dollars to the United States. The naval program which I have recommended would provide a better Navy and a more efficient Navy and a more powerful Navy than the one which the Senator is so loudly clamoring for. I would not say that he is not the friend of America because of his advocacy of an archaic and more or less obsolete Navy.

Admiral Fullam, one of the most distinguished American naval officers, testified before the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate and he condemned the 1915-16 program. He insisted that it was a one-plane program—that is, that it gave us a navy which, if not obsolete, was obsolescent, and one which was not adequate or suitable for this Nation. He insisted that we should have a "three-plane" Navy, and that it was the height of folly to expend \$1,000,000,000 upon a navy which when complete would not be modern or suited to naval warfare. He recommended the completion of the six battleships, which were more than 70 per cent complete, but opposed the completion of any battle cruisers. I have gone beyond this distinguished admiral and have recommended that we complete one battle cruiser. He contended that we should devise a program that would give us a fighting force in the air and a fighting Navy beneath the surface of the sea. Sir Percy Scott and other recognized naval authorities have supported a naval program of this character. I am in favor of a modern, scientific, up-to-date naval program. Those who are violently and fatuously and stubbornly supporting the 1915 naval program are reactionary and behind the times, and their criticisms of those of us who oppose that policy and offer a better and superior one will, in my opinion, find little response among thoughtful, patriotic American citizens. I have mentioned a number of times, but the statements of the Senator compel me to repeat, that Great Britain, applying the lessons of the war, has abandoned the building of battleships and battle cruisers. She had four battle cruisers upon the stocks when the armistice was signed, and destroyed three and completed but one. Great Britain is not spending, as the Senator states, more money for naval construction than the United States, nor is it true that Japan is spending as much or more as the United States. The facts are that our naval-construction program calls for nearly 300 per cent more than the amount which Japan proposes to spend.

I have no doubt, however, that the belligerent attitude of some Americans and some Senators and the menacing and warlike

talk that echoes here in this Chamber and elsewhere in the United States will result in Great Britain and Japan revising their naval programs and will induce them to spend more than they had planned to devote to naval purposes during the current and future years.

When we declare that they are "rivals on sea," and that "war is imminent," and that they are a "menace to our peace," we must expect that this hostile attitude will react against us and result in their pursuing a naval and military policy more extensive and elaborate than they desire or have contemplated. When we talk war and when we denounce other nations and declare that they are our rivals and are menacing us and that war is imminent, we must expect that other nations will become alarmed and feel constrained to adopt measures which they conceive to be essential for their protection.

Mr. President, the Senator takes the incongruous and inconsistent position of asserting that, having declared in the act of August, 1916, in favor of the President of the United States appointing a commission to confer with other nations for the purpose of limiting armaments, we have done all that duty to humanity requires, and that we may sit quietly by and wait for other nations to seek a conference with us, and that if they fail it is our duty to continue arming and building warships and taxing the country billions of dollars for military and naval armaments.

Mr. President, the inconsistency of that position is reflected in the fact that the Senator himself voted for the League of Nations notwithstanding the act of 1916, to which he refers, which he says foreclosed us from doing anything else until advances were made by other nations. He voted to join the League of Nations and to adopt a plan of disarmament. Because we failed to enter the League of Nations, to do our part there for disarmament, his contention is that our duty is ended, and we must wait for other nations to come to us. Have they not come to us? Were we not importuned to enter the League of Nations? Did not the League of Nations communicate with this Government, and ask that even in a consultative capacity we send representatives to confer with the committee or the commission that was seeking to bring about a reduction in armaments?

I entirely agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] when he expressed last evening regret that the President of the United States did not respond to that invitation that we should join with the nations of the world, members of the League of Nations, for the purpose of their securing a reduction in the military and naval armaments of the world. I presume that President Wilson felt that he ought not to embarrass the next administration by adopting a policy which it might oppose. In other words, he wanted to leave to President Harding a clear field to determine the international policy which should be pursued by the United States with respect to the League of Nations and all cognate questions, including disarmament or a reduction of armament. But, Mr. President, that is not all. The League of Nations, including Japan and Great Britain, though we were not members of the league, and signified no purpose to join with them in disarming, appointed a commission, as I have stated, for the purpose of adopting or recommending a plan for disarmament. What have we done? What are we doing to evidence to the world a desire to disarm? It is true that we passed a resolution last evening which signifies our willingness to consider this question.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator asked the question, "What are we doing?" and he prefaced it by the statement that the League of Nations invited us to enter into a scheme of disarmament. I can answer the Senator. We are trying to carry out a program which was adopted before this war, and which will increase the United States Navy so that it will not be helpless. What are they doing? Since the League of Nations was formed Japan has been increasing her naval force as fast as men and her money will do it. Since the League of Nations was formed and since the resolution was passed England has been pursuing exactly the same policy as Japan. Since the League of Nations was formed, and since the resolution referred to by the Senator was passed, France has been strengthening her Army, and the papers told us in last night's telegrams that she was preparing to invade Germany. So it appears that notwithstanding they have their blessed League of Nations all to themselves, to play with as they please, every one of them is increasing her armament, and not one of them dreams of relying upon this dream.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri was one of the first men in public life in the United States to lift his powerful and eloquent voice against the League of Nations. He has fought it with a consistency, and ability, and I was

about to say with a bitterness, but I shall not use that term, that does credit to his skill as a parliamentarian, as a great debater, and as a protagonist of any cause. I differ from the Senator from Missouri upon this question. I believe that my friend from Missouri took a view of the League of Nations that was not entirely warranted. His opposition undoubtedly contributed to the strength attained by the anti-League movement in the United States, and he can be credited with having aided in compassing the defeat of the Versailles treaty in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri calls the League of Nations a dream. If it is a dream it is a noble dream. The enduring and worthy things of life have been the result of dreams and visions and ideals. When there is no vision the people perish. This was said of old by one who spake with prophetic voice. It was true then; it is true now. Men of vision and of ideals and who respond to the inspiration of a power greater than man are needed in this hour when the problems of the World War remain to be solved and questions affecting the present and future welfare of humanity demand intelligent and wise consideration.

The practical and utilitarian man is likewise needed. The post-war problems can not be solved by the mere announcement of precepts no matter how beautiful they may be or the policies of mere doctrinaires. There must be, of course, big men to deal with these big problems; men who know the philosophy of life, the psychology of human nature, and who have a comprehension of the concrete and utilitarian things that lie in our pathway. But no man can bring order to this distracted world and lift humanity out of their despair and chaos who fails to appreciate the great moral and vital powers which lie at the base of genuine progress and definite, enduring advancement.

A league of nations is not a wild and visionary scheme or the product of a disordered mind. Some of the most practical statesmen and leaders who have guided humanity have earnestly sought the establishment of a league of nations. Practical men, guided by high ideals, inspired by the thought of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, will sooner or later put into operation a plan which will result in a league of nations or a practical working scheme of international co-operation which will secure disarmament and the substitution of courts and judicial tribunals for the sword and the battle fields. The future is full of promise and the dreamers and the prophets and the inspired of God will lead humanity to higher planes of service and of achievement.

It implies no lack of devotion to a strong and proper spirit of nationalism to support a policy looking to international fellowship and international agreements. Already there are hundreds of international organizations cooperating and working for the welfare of the peoples of all countries. Of course, no one desires what Dr. Butler has described as a "colloidal" internationalism. National integrity and national prerogatives must be preserved, but their preservation does not forbid international union in the interest of peace and the happiness and welfare of all. The work of great men, of the spiritual leaders and philosophers and idealists of the world, have furnished the charts and the compass which have guided humanity. It was Pericles who said to the Athenians, "The whole earth is a sepulcher of famous men, and their glory is graven not only in stone but on their native earth, and lives on far away without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives." The great poet of democracy, Walt Whitman, spoke with inspiration when he said that what the past was not, the future will be.

The Senator refers to the fact that notwithstanding the League of Nations, nations are arming and "not one of them dreams of relying on the dream of the league." Mr. President, no one believed that the world could pass from the shadows of the war into the sunlight of peace without convulsions and serious difficulties and perhaps conflicts. Time, no matter what agreements might have followed the war, was and is necessary to bring adjustment and to secure international confidence and the necessary cooperation for peace and amity. In my opinion, however, if the United States had entered the league, its work would have been far more efficient and the progress of the world toward peace and readjustment would have been infinitely greater. It was not contended that the league would immediately bring international good will and perfect peace. Everyone recognized that suspicions and national antipathies would persist to a greater or less degree and for an indefinite period, but it was felt that an international organization functioning along legitimate and proper lines, would be an effective agency toward world harmony and world regeneration.

The principles of international law announced by Grotius did not immediately bring the benefits and blessings which international law are calculated to secure, but there has been improvement in international relations as a wider acquaintance with the principles of international law has been obtained. And a union between nations to secure peace and disarmament and to promote the welfare of the people of the world can not immediately, following its organization, realize all that was hoped in its behalf and which in the very nature of things could only be realized in the future.

It must also be remembered that there were serious matters to be undertaken by the league, and the settlement of questions committed to it every reasonable person anticipated would result in temporary disturbances and possible controversies if not conflicts.

The conditions in Europe are not in my judgment an argument against the wisdom and feasibility of a League of Nations. Rather they furnish reasons for an efficient and suitable international organization. The Senator, I believe, is in error when he states that none of the members of the league dreams of relying upon what the Senator denominates "a dream." All members of the league are anxious for this Nation to take its place with them in the league in order that the purposes for which it was organized may be fully realized. And they are developing the plans of the league and putting them into operation. Most nations are longing for peace and disarmament and for world cooperation. With or without a league it was to have been expected that the enforcement of the terms of the Versailles treaty would result in controversy and perhaps resentments. Everywhere statesmen who have advocated a league have realized that occasions might arise when force would be required in order to preserve the peace of the world. No one denies the practical statemanship of Theodore Roosevelt. He declared in his Nobel prize speech that the League of Nations, the formation of which he advocated, should provide to enforce its decrees and to compel recalcitrant nations by force to maintain the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the Senator asks, "What is France doing? What is Japan doing? What is England doing?" He points out that France now has a standing army of approximately 800,000 men, and is, as he says, ready to invade Germany. We sent our boys overseas, Mr. President, and they fought with the sons of France in a common cause, for a common victory, and they gave their lives as French boys did in defense of liberty and the cause of civilization. When the armistice was signed one would think from the attitude of the Senator from Missouri that our task in Europe was ended; that we ought to have hastily withdrawn therefrom and left our allies to work out the problems which victory necessarily produced. I will not say that such a course as that would have been cowardly, but it certainly would not have been the course that should have been taken by a just nation which had joined with other nations to maintain a great issue and to defend an undying cause.

President Roosevelt, in one of the last speeches delivered, called attention to what our duty would be when the war should end. He said it was the duty of the Allies, including the United States, to seek for the stabilization of Europe, preserve Poland and other nations resulting from the war, enforce the indemnities imposed upon the Central Empires and their allies, see that France obtained Alsace-Lorraine, expel the Turks from Europe, and discharge other imperative post-war obligations. He never suggested that we should desert our allies. We refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles, and it is insisted now by some that we have no concern in European affairs and in questions arising out of the war. Have we done our duty to our own country, to our allies, and to the world? Is there no obligation resting upon this Nation to aid in consolidating the results of the war? Shall we condemn the league or France for their endeavors to carry out the provisions of the treaty? Because we have declined to ratify it, shall it be an act of offense upon the part of France and Great Britain and others of our allies for them to attempt to compel Germany to comply with her solemn obligations?

France feels compelled, with the aid of some of the allied nations, to act against Germany for the enforcement of the treaty of Versailles. I do not know what the Senator from Missouri would do. I do not know what he thinks France should do. Certainly he can not contend, nor can anyone, that France should abandon the terms of the Versailles treaty and allow Germany to repudiate her agreement and claim immunity from the obligations which the treaty imposes upon her. France is justified in maintaining an army until Germany gives clear and satisfactory evidence of her purpose to carry out the treaty or until arrangements shall be entered into that will be entirely satisfactory to her and to the other signatories to the treaty.

The Senator says, "What is England doing?" And he intimated, as I understood his position, as did also the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], that Great Britain is now spending large sums in her naval building. I have not time to call attention to the numerous papers and documents which I have here to prove that Great Britain is not building a single capital ship. She is abandoning that policy, and has indicated by her representatives that if the United States desires to have a larger navy than Great Britain the United States is entirely welcome to that luxury.

Reference has been made to Japan. The Senator says that Japan is building ships "just as fast as she can." Let me read to the Senate an editorial from the Scientific American, under date of February 12, 1921. The editorial is entitled "Disarmament of the British Navy," and is as follows:

DISARMAMENT OF THE BRITISH NAVY.

Although we are most heartily in favor of a universal reduction of naval and military armaments, we deplore the fact that there has been, and is to-day, much confused and misleading speech and writing upon this momentous subject. Some of this confusion of thought is unintentional and due to lack of knowledge, but too much of it is intentionally misleading and deliberate. If we are to get anywhere in this discussion we must start with clearly ascertained facts and proceed by sincere and logical reasoning.

That very small minority in our Navy Department which would like to see the United States spend about \$1,000,000,000 in building "incomparably the most powerful fleet in the world" has endeavored to give the impression that a great naval shipbuilding competition is in progress between the other leading navies and ourselves. Now, as regards the British Navy this is absolutely untrue. If there be any naval race we have the course entirely to ourselves, for Great Britain is doing no new shipbuilding whatsoever, and relatively to our own fleet that of Great Britain is not so powerful as it was before the war. To be clear upon this point, let us consider the past seven years and the losses of the British by war and by the breaking up and sale of ships since the armistice.

During the war Great Britain lost out of her fighting fleet over 600,000 tons, or two-thirds as much tonnage as there was in the United States fleet in 1914. The facts regarding this tremendous depletion of her navy are to be found in a pamphlet published by our Office of Naval Intelligence, entitled "Information concerning the United States Navy and Other Navies." From this we learn that her losses by mine, submarine, shell fire, and other causes were as follows: Three battle cruisers, including the super battle cruiser *Queen Mary* (63,000 tons); 13 battleships, including the 23,000-ton dreadnaught *Audacious*, and the 19,250-ton dreadnaught *Vanguard* (201,000 tons); 10 armored cruisers (151,000 tons); 9 light cruisers (51,500 tons); 6 monitors (8,125 tons); 67 destroyers (50,500 tons); 52 submarines (37,000 tons); and 22 sloops (26,000 tons). The total, including other smaller craft, is over 600,000 tons. Added to this was a loss of 37 merchant auxiliaries, including many ships of from 12,000 to 18,000 tons, which brings the total loss to nearly three-quarters of a million tons.

To make good these losses and to keep pace with the demands of the war, she took in hand a large program of new construction. But when victory was assured and the world menace of the German fleet had been removed, all outstanding contracts were canceled, except in the case of certain vessels of the smaller types that were near completion; and a large number of ships, including three sister ships to the 42,000-ton battle cruiser *Hood*, were broken up on the stocks and sold as junk. As a matter of fact, it is some seven and a half years since the British Admiralty laid down a battleship, and of light craft not one has been ordered since the fall of 1918.

Furthermore, in agreement with her conviction that the war was indeed over and a period of peace and reduction of armaments was at hand, Great Britain struck off from her active list practically the whole of her big fleet of prewar dreadnaught battleships, her armored cruisers, her protected cruisers, and a large number of destroyers, submarines, and other smaller craft, the list totaling about 150 ships that were either retired, sold, or broken up. Not only this, but she has tentatively condemned all of her capital ships that are armed with guns of 12-inch caliber or less; and although she has still on the list 26 dreadnaught battleships, several of these that are armed with a 12-inch gun are in reserve or have been delegated to minor duties as practice ships, gun-training ships, etc.

Another point, which is perhaps the most significant of all and one which will be fully appreciated by all naval men, is that in her whole fleet there is only one ship, the *Hood*, which embodies in its construction and arrangements the enormous amount of technical information gleaned from the Battle of Jutland, information which was loyally passed on to the experts of her ally, the United States. Had she gone ahead with her program as we have done, she would to-day have in her fleet three additional ships of the *Hood* class; her fleet of light cruisers would have been greatly increased; and she would have added over 100 ships to her fleet of destroyers and submarines, all of these vessels embodying the lessons of the war and particularly those of the Jutland engagement.

We think we have made it clear that in this matter of disarmament Great Britain has already taken the lead, since she has not only greatly reduced her existing navy, but for two years past has refrained from laying down any new warships. Here was a lead in naval disarmament which we might very well have followed, and those of us who are keeping our heads clear of international suspicions and hatreds, and are looking at facts as they are, must feel that there is no little truth in the following statement of the British Naval and Military Record: "Had the United States followed our lead in effecting such sweeping reductions in naval material, the world would not now be faced with the prospect of a new era of naval rivalry. It is practically certain that but for the American decision to complete not merely all the vessels authorized by the 1916 program but nearly all the destroyers, submarines, etc., ordered under the emergency war programs, Japan would not have introduced her 1920-1928 navy bill, thus giving a new and powerful impetus to international competition."

I call attention particularly to the last paragraph, which refers to the effect upon Japan of our naval program calling for more than \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. President, Count Ishii, speaking for Japan, recently said:

At the recent assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva the Japanese delegates supported a resolution on the subject of disarmament, but in the matter of immediate realities the Japanese Government is most desirous of reaching a solution which would end the race in armaments for all time. If the United States will ally itself with the great naval powers to establish a "naval holiday" Japan will be among the first to agree to it.

Reference has been made to the expenditures of Japan for her navy. I have here, Mr. President, the Financial and Economic Annual of Japan for the year 1919, which contains the appropriations made by Japan since the year 1905 for her army and navy, and a perusal of this—and I will not take the time to read it—shows how pitifully small have been appropriations made by Japan for her navy, measured by the stupendous appropriations which we have made and are now making for the Navy of the United States.

I submit that the naval officers of the Navy Department have failed to give to the Senate of the United States and to Congress that full and complete information which is essential to enable Congress to wisely and properly deal with the naval program.

Admiral Sims states that the report of the General Naval Board, which is a defense of the 1916 program, "is very largely mistaken. It looks to me very much like a report the arguments of which are drawn up to prove what they originally believed."

In my opinion this is a condemnation of the pending bill, or, at least, a disapproval of the naval policy which this bill seeks to fasten upon the country. Mr. President, without reading, I ask to insert in the Record as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Scientific American under date of February 26, 1921.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

A NAVY EQUAL TO ANY OTHER.

The report of the Senate Naval Committee contains not a word of sympathy with the request of a war-weary world to be relieved, at least in some measure, of the burden of naval and military armaments under which it labors. To have recognized the widespread prevalence of its plea, which has been fully as vocal in these United States as elsewhere, would have shown that the committee was alive to the untold miseries and sorrows of the world and was in responsive sympathy with the present attitude of American people whom it represents.

The report confines itself strictly to technical matters, and it contains three outstanding features. First it warns the country against being carried away by exaggerated statements as to the relative value of battleships as against airplanes and submarines. With this attitude of the General Board and the Senate Naval Committee we are in most thorough accord. For the present, and probably for many a year to come, the battleship will dominate the situation.

The second outstanding feature of the report is the statement that "this country should maintain a navy at least equal to that of any other power." At one time this statement would have been fraught with danger to the peace of the world; for during the years when the German Navy was looming up as a threat to the insular security of Great Britain, it was the avowed policy of that country to maintain a navy superior to that of any other power. The removal of the German peril, coupled with the feeling of comradeship and understanding which was developed by our own and the British Navy during the war, has so far changed the situation that Great Britain seems willing to make an exception in the case of the Navy of the United States. Certain British statesmen and naval men have indeed asserted that they would view without any misgiving the creation of a United States Navy that was equal in strength to her own. It is true that in its statement that we should possess a navy equal to any other the General Board of the Navy is announcing an entirely new policy, so far as any public utterance emanating from that board is concerned. Be that as it may, the acceptance by Great Britain of the new standard removes any danger of international complications; and a friendly cooperation of the two navies may well prove a powerful influence for the maintenance of peace and the general security of traffic on the high seas.

So far, so good. But when we consider the third recommendation of this report, to the effect that we should continue the construction of the whole of the 1916 program, we feel it our duty to utter a strong word of protest; first, because, as we showed last week, the completion of the full program would not only make our Navy equal to that of any other but immeasurably stronger, and therefore we should be committed to a vast expenditure of moneys which would carry our Navy far beyond the standard which is here definitely laid down by the General Board.

And this leads us to reiterate our demand on the part of the taxpayers of the United States that we complete only the four 16-inch gun battleships of the *Maryland* class and the six battle cruisers of the *Constellation* class, and that we at once discontinue work on the six 43,000-ton battleships of the *Indiana* class and concentrate our new constructive efforts upon additional scouts, upon flotilla leaders, and upon airplane carriers, thereby rounding out our Navy. This program will give us by 1924 a fleet that is not only somewhat larger in displacement and gun power than the British fleet, but one which, because of its very modern construction and its inclusion of all the lessons learned during the war will possess a decided fighting superiority in capital ships over the British fleet, a fact which the General Board can not deny. If we hold up the work on the six *Indians* upon which only a mere commencement has been made, we shall still have 800,000 tons against Great Britain's 808,000 tons, and our gun energy will be 20,500,000 foot-tons against Great Britain's 19,000,000 foot-tons. Furthermore, the bulk of our fighting line will consist of thoroughly modern ships; whereas the best of the British ships, with the single exception of the *Hood*, will be from 8 to 10 years old, and therefore will be obsolescent and outclassed. These significant truths should be embodied in this report. Why are they omitted?

These facts are not known to the average taxpayer, and unless they are clearly brought out on the floor of the Senate and the House they

will not be understood by the majority of the Members of Congress. They are perfectly well known to the General Board, and they should be equally well known to the members of the Senate committee. In all fairness, then, to the country whose interests have been committed in all good faith to the committees of the Senate and the House and to the Members of Congress as a whole, it should be clearly stated that *the building of these six huge ships at a cost of nearly \$250,000,000 will be superfluous, extravagant, and a deliberate advance beyond the standard of strength definitely called for by the most experienced experts of our Navy as represented by the General Board.* The argument that to stop work on these six ships would be a wasteful extravagance is not borne out by the facts. Very little has been done, and what has been built in the way of castings for turbines and generators and motors and the laying of keel plates will suffer no deterioration if it be allowed to rest for a while until the time is ripe for the completion of these ships.

[Senate Report No. 766, part 2, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session.]

SUSPENSION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

MINORITY REPORT BY MR. KING.

I am unable to concur in the majority report submitted on February 9. Within the limits of this report it will be impossible to present all the reasons which impel me to withhold my assent from the majority report.

On January 25 the Senate passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs be, and is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether in its opinion it is practical and also a sound policy to suspend our naval building program now in progress for the period of six months to the end that a full investigation and free discussion may be had as to what constitutes a modern fighting navy—a navy with the types of ships and with the air and submarine weapons that would be most effective in the strategy and tactics of future war on the sea; and also to the end that we may avail ourselves in the matter, both as to economy and efficiency, of any possible agreement between naval powers providing for the reduction of armaments."

"Resolved further, That said committee report to the Senate such data and information (not already printed and made public) as the said committee has had before it for consideration relative to the probable value of surface ships in future naval warfare."

The following day the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs referred the resolution to the Secretary of the Navy.

On the 22d of January, a few days prior thereto, the Secretary addressed a letter to the General Board of the Navy, in which he stated that Congress was not disposed to authorize the construction of any more capital ships, due to the amount of construction in hand, and that the question as to the type of ship which should form the main strength of navies in the future was being extensively discussed both in America and England, and the board was requested to take this matter into consideration and report on the general subject early in February. There is nothing to indicate that the Senate resolution was ever before the General Board of the Navy, nor was it requested to specifically report thereon.

On February 2 the General Board made a report to the Secretary of the Navy, which the Secretary, so far as the record discloses, regarded as a complete response to the inquiries contained in the Senate resolution, and on the same day he transmitted the report to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The attitude and views of the General Board of the Navy on the general question of the naval program were well known. It is not believed that the Senate desired to have solely the views of the General Board, when the Committee on Naval Affairs was requested to report upon the various matters referred to in the resolution. The report of the board consists mainly of an argument in favor of the capital ship as the "paramount type of naval vessel"; and it assumes to call the proposal for the arrest or suspension of the big ship program a policy of "surprise, ruse, dodging, and strategem" as against a policy of "knockout blows."

Generally speaking, this report might have been prepared five or six years ago and reveals a predetermination to adhere to a program fashioned in 1915 and crystallized into law in 1916, without giving due weight to the lessons of the recent war and the development of the submarine, torpedo, mines, and the multitudinous forms of aerial warfare.

Speaking of the report of the General Board, Admiral Sims stated: "I think the report is very largely mistaken. It looks to me very much like a report the arguments of which are drawn up to prove what they originally believed. It looks to me like a document of that kind. As I stated informally a little while ago, so conservative are military people in their attitude toward new incidents that that is the first development we always have."

I respectfully submit that the criticism of Admiral Sims of the report of the General Board is entirely warranted, and in view of the antiquity of some of the positions therein assumed, justifies incredulity as to its merits, if not positive opposition to its conclusions, in the minds of those who are seeking a wise and prudent naval policy for the United States.

It is respectfully submitted that the committee failed to answer the terms of the resolution calling for a report as to the "economy and efficiency of any possible agreement between naval powers providing for the reduction of armaments."

In my opinion it was not alone sufficient to report the material disadvantages, if any, that would result from a suspension of the naval building program for a period of six months. The vital question, indeed, is the possibility of agreement between naval powers that will result in the reduction of armaments. That such an agreement would result in "economy," if not "efficiency," must be manifest to every fair investigator. The burdens resting upon the people of the United States, growing out of naval and military armaments, are intolerable, and the financial condition of the Government calls for immediate relief from further staggering demands for such purposes. This vital matter relating to the "economy and efficiency" that would result from a possible agreement between naval powers to secure the reduction of armaments, I repeat, was not considered by the committee, nor was any testimony sought or obtained relating to such question or to the possibility of such an agreement between the naval powers of the world. The majority report declares that the—

"Committee are as anxious to bring about a reduction of armament and relief from the burdens which those armaments impose upon the nations of the earth as anyone can be, but no disarmament would be of any value unless it was general, and in the cases of great maritime powers universal disarmament. Unhappily this is not the case at the present time, and we must deal with the conditions as they exist."

This statement seems to indicate a disbelief in the possibility of a reduction of armaments, or relief from the burdens thereby imposed upon the people. No testimony was taken by the committee justifying such a position, and no reasons are assigned in the committee's report for conclusions so strongly announced. I concede, however, that one witness who appeared before the committee, an admiral of ability and distinction, did testify in harmony with the committee's report. His position was that the development of international law and international morality would not lead to disarmament or promote world peace. He stated:

"All this talk of disarmament is absolutely and scientifically wrong. It is not in accordance with the teachings of history. It is euphemistic to start with, and any argument that can be made against unpreparedness can be made against disarmament. * * * Disarmament in a great country always precedes a toboggan slide every time. That is the first symptom."

In reply to this statement, a member of the committee suggested that the sentiments expressed "command a very able advocate in Bernhardi."

The witness replied that as a military man he found his argument based upon history. He further stated that—

"Anything that can reasonably be done to prevent war is a splendid thing; but that reduction of armament would not tend to that end."

The witness was then asked the following question:

"Q. So you don't look forward then to any decrease whatever in the burdens of the peoples of the world of maintaining these great armaments; you feel that those have got to be borne, and they have got to be increased continuously; you do not look for any relief whatever in that direction?"

The reply of the admiral was as follows:

"A. I will put it this way—I do not like to appear as a prophet, but will say that according to history that is the way it has always been. If there is anything to change the current of history, then, of course, that will have a bearing."

The admiral further stated that he did not believe that a reduction of armaments was possible even "though nations should enter into agreements to that effect, because the agreement would not last very long"; he thought "it might last 20 years."

The following question was then propounded to the witness:

"Q. If wars have existed from the dawn of history while Governments have been armed, don't you think if they fail to arm, or if they reduce their armaments, or enter into an agreement for disarmament, that it might result in a cessation of war?"

This reply was given:

"A. No; I am absolutely sure, as far as I can be sure of anything in the future, and I am only basing it upon 5,000 years of history, and that is a good deal."

Further questions were propounded to the admiral, and his answers thereto are as follows:

"Q. In short, you find no chances to escape from the burden of competitive armament?—A. I would like to see the burden made as light as possible, Senator, but I do not see—on looking at it in the light of history and the way in which we are going now; competition among the people and the tendency of overseas trade—there is hope for cessation of war."

"Q. If you think that an agreement for the reduction of armaments would be entirely ineffective, you must equally agree that an agreement for the purpose of not increasing armaments—that is, holding them stable—would be equally ineffective. Am I right?—A. I am afraid it would be ineffective."

"Q. So that the necessary conclusion at which we must arrive is that there is no possible escape from the burden of competitive armaments, and you can see no relief whatever in any line from the rivalry in which we are now engaged?—A. I am sorry to say it, but I think so."

"Q. And that would mean that we have to continue our naval and military burdens indefinitely?—A. I think so."

The committee's report seems to be founded upon the view of this distinguished admiral, and falls to take into account, as I view the case, conditions and factors existent in the world which introduce meliorating currents and moral forces that compel a judgment at variance with that expressed by the board and the committee.

This view seems to be that the war taught no lesson except that savagery and sanguinary struggles are eternal; that the moral forces in the world are too feeble to establish justice and usher in a reign of righteousness and peace; and that humanity is predestined to walk in the darkness to a tragic end.

This view is a negation of the vital and progressive forces in the world, and forever condemns mankind to Sisyphean struggles. The report, in one aspect, proceeds upon the erroneous assumption that the resolution proposed to abandon battleships, and the majority of the committee proceeds upon the assumption that the question for determination is one primarily of the abandonment of the battleship, rather than supplementing that type of vessel by other craft operating in the air and in the sea. This misconception of the resolution has resulted in the failure of the committee to respond to the question implied in the resolution. It is not the part of probity and good judgment to ignore the fact that the science of naval architecture and armament has been constantly progressing, and we may not even now say that the ultimate type in any arm of the service has been developed. The report of the General Board is a slavish adherence to the past and betrays a determination to regard with jealousy, if not disdain, the unmistakable lessons brought to our attention by the recent war and the scientific investigations more recently made by those who believe in the future of aeronautics and in the primacy of submarines and submersible types of vessels. It is bureaucratic and reflects bureaucratic influences and policies.

Emphasis is laid upon the fact that the battleship is the basis of sea power; that it is paramount, and "that nothing that occurred during the World War has served to change the opinion of the General Board as to the vital importance in war of the battleship."

In my opinion, the report of the General Board is the plea of an advocate in defense of a policy rather archaic in conception and at variance in some respects, at least, with facts and experiences developed at a later period.

A careful review of this report leads to but one conclusion, that battleships constitute the principal unit of sea power, and that we must continue their construction in increasing numbers notwithstanding the enormous cost. It is admitted that if there is no agreement between nations to limit armaments, then, in addition to the Navy projected by the General Board, we must expend hundreds of millions of dollars for submarines and torpedo boats and the various forms of aircraft employed in

naval warfare. It would seem from the report that the lessons of the war called only for greater expenditures for naval warfare.

Giant dreadnaughts of more than 43,000 tons and costing tens of millions of dollars are to be built, but the board concedes they are impotent, or at least inadequate, without battle cruisers costing still more, and also various other types of surface craft, submarines, and airplanes.

A one-plane navy, the report is compelled to admit, is incomplete, and it discusses torpedo-carrying aircraft and bombing planes and submarines and concedes them an humble place as auxiliaries of the battleships, but, as I have indicated, does not ascribe to them that important place in naval warfare which the facts demonstrate that they occupy.

I repeat, in my opinion, the report of the General Board is reactionary, not only in its consideration of the future of naval warfare, but in its complete disregard of all those social and moral factors which are powerfully operating in the world to-day.

I have stated that the science of naval architecture is progressive and that a blind devotion to past types is fatal. On December 11, 1906, His Majesty's ship *Dreadnaught* was commissioned. It was the product of Lord Fisher's constructive genius, and was hailed as the most powerful naval vessel in the world, though it carried only ten 12-inch guns and had a displacement of but 17,900 tons and a speed of 21½ knots. This vessel became the type of the modern single-caliber big-gun battleship. In our own Navy the battleships *Connecticut*, *Georgia*, *New Jersey*, *Rhode Island*, *Louisiana*, and *Virginia*, which were commissioned in 1906, and the *Arkansas*, *Minnesota*, *Wyoming*, and *Vermont*, which were commissioned in 1907; the *New Hampshire*, commissioned in 1908; and the *Michigan* and *South Carolina*, which were commissioned in 1910, were all mixed-caliber battleships, and upon the standard of the new dreadnaught type established by Great Britain in 1906 were obsolete vessels at the time they were commissioned. This is a direct example of the mistaken policy in pressing naval construction in ignorance of contemporary improvements in naval architecture and standard naval types.

It was August 31, 1911, before the *Utah*, the first American dreadnaught, was commissioned. This was nearly five years after the commission of the first British dreadnaught. There are now eight of these dreadnaughts in commission, the *Utah*, *Florida*, *Delaware*, *North Dakota*, *Wyoming*, *Arkansas*, *New York*, and the *Texas*. The displacement of the *Utah* was 21,195 tons. Since then we have the superdreadnaught of 32,000 tons, and of these superdreadnaughts we now have in commission the *New Mexico*, *Idaho*, *Nevada*, *Pennsylvania*, *Arizona*, *Oklahoma*, *Mississippi*, and *Tennessee*.

I do not agree with the General Board and the committee that the naval program of 1916 should be carried out, nor do I accept the view that a suspension, or at least a partial suspension, of that program would be unwise, or that efforts should not be made to bring about a reduction in armaments, not only in the United States, but throughout the world; and I submit a few reasons in support of my position.

First, let me invite attention to the 1916 program. In 1915, the General Board of the Navy "devised and recommended" a naval program; it was based upon the then existing types of naval vessels and the then existing theories of naval warfare. The board did not have the experience and lessons of the war; and the program was devoted to the creation of types of vessels then employed. This program was embodied in the act of August 29, 1916. The intervention of the war and the need of destroyers and submarine chasers to combat the submarine menace and to protect our battleships was so great that the entire construction capacity of the country was directed to the production of these fast craft, as a result of which the program of 1916 was held in abeyance. It is true that during and since the war considerable work has been done upon some of the ships provided by this program; but it is now proposed to proceed with the construction projected in 1915, regardless of its costs or the lessons of the war, and the Navy Department is exercising all possible pressure in order to consummate this purpose.

The act of Congress of 1916 authorized the construction of 10 first-class battleships, at a cost not to exceed \$11,500,000 each; 6 battle cruisers, at a cost not to exceed \$18,500,000 each; 10 scout cruisers, at a cost not to exceed \$5,000,000 each; 50 torpedo-boat destroyers, at a cost not to exceed \$1,200,000 each; and 9 fleet submarines, 58 coast submarines, 3 of which were to cost not exceeding \$1,200,000 each and a residue not to exceed \$700,000 each; 3 fuel ships, at a cost not to exceed \$1,500,000 each; 1 repair ship, 1 transport, 1 hospital ship, at a cost not to exceed \$2,350,000 each; 2 destroyer tenders, 1 fleet submarine tender, 2 ammunition ships, at a cost not to exceed \$2,350,000 each; 2 gunboats, at a cost not to exceed \$860,000.

From the hearings before the Senate it developed that all the construction authorized by the act just referred to has been undertaken, except that the contracts for 12 destroyers, 1 transport, and 6 seagoing submarines have not been let. Admiral Countz testified that the bureau did not intend to build these, but desired authority to construct two airplane carriers, at a cost of \$58,000,000, in their stead.

Though the act of 1916 authorized the construction of 10 battleships, there are 11 under construction, 1 having been previously authorized.

The pertinent fact is that we have now under construction and in various stages of completion 17 capital ships, plans for which were laid down more than five years ago. These ships divide themselves into three groups, as follows:

FIRST GROUP.

Name.	Where building.	State of completion.	Tonnage.	Horsepower.	Knots.
California.....	Mare Island, Calif.....	95.5	32,300	28,500	21
Maryland.....	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	93.0	32,600	28,900	21
Colorado.....	New York Shipbuilding Corporation.	66.7	32,600	28,900	21
Washington.....	do.....	57.6	32,600	29,900	21
West Virginia.....	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	44.5	32,600	28,900	21

The average state of completion of the ships in this group is 71.46 per cent. These ships are of the superdreadnaught type, of approximately equal displacement, horsepower, and speed, and all except the *California* mount 16-inch guns. The *California* mounts 14-inch guns. Their completion would give the Navy 21 capital ships of the dreadnaught and superdreadnaught type of the most modern construction and effectiveness, which, with 21 second-class battleships now in commission, would give us a Navy of 42 battleships.

SECOND GROUP.

Name.	Where building.	State of completion.	Tonnage.	Horsepower.	Knots.
South Dakota..	New York Navy Yard.....	22.3	43,200	60,000	23
North Carolina..	Norfolk Navy Yard.....	21.8	43,200	60,000	23
Indiana.....	New York Navy Yard.....	18.2	43,200	60,000	23
Montana.....	Mare Island Navy Yard.....	16.6	43,200	60,000	23
Iowa.....	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	13.1	43,200	60,000	23
Massachusetts..	Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation.	1.2	43,200	60,000	23

The average state of completion of the ships in this group is 15.53 per cent. These battleships are all designed to mount twelve 16-inch guns. They are over 10,000 tons heavier in displacement than the superdreadnaughts in the preceding class, have more than double the horsepower, and only a speed of 2 knots in excess of the five superdreadnaughts in the preceding class. There are no battleships or battle cruisers in the British Navy or the Japanese Navy of equal displacement and power.

THIRD GROUP (BATTLE CRUISERS).

Name.	Where building.	State of completion.	Tonnage.	Horsepower.	Knots.
Saratoga.....	New York Shipbuilding Corporation.	13.3	43,500	180,000	33.25
Lexington.....	Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation.	7.7	43,500	180,000	33.25
Constellation...	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	5.1	43,500	180,000	33.25
Constitution...	Philadelphia Navy Yard.....	2.3	43,500	180,000	33.25
United States...do.....	2.3	43,500	180,000	33.25
Ranger.....	Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.	1.0	43,500	180,000	33.25

The average state of completion of these battle cruisers is 5.28 per cent.

The part of the program covering the construction of destroyers, submarines, and auxiliaries is comparatively small measured by the cost of the capital ships.

The authorization of Congress in 1916 was for ships, the cost of the most powerful of which was not to exceed \$16,500,000, and the execution of the entire program was estimated at approximately \$544,700,000. Notwithstanding the limits placed by Congress in the act, appropriations have been made from time to time since then, until they now aggregate approximately \$500,000,000, and yet the naval program of 1916 is not complete. In my opinion it will require at least five hundred millions more for the completion of the ships authorized in the act of August 29, 1916, and with their completion, as I shall show later, hundreds of millions of dollars additional will be required for the construction of undersea boats and for airplanes and the necessary naval airships, without which the capital ships would be of but little if any value.

In the hearings before the Senate committee one of the admirals, who was a leading member of the General Board of the Navy, stated that the cost of the capital ships would be \$45,000,000 each. Upon this basis the ultimate cost of the 17 capital ships will be \$765,000,000. When we add to this vast sum the cost of scout cruisers, torpedo boats, destroyers, submarines, transports, fuel ships, tenders, gunboats, and auxiliaries, it is certain that the further cost for the completion of the 1916 naval program will exceed \$1,000,000,000.

But with this expenditure, stupendous as it is, the chapter is not ended. Additional carrier ships at enormous costs will be required, submarines of greater range and power will be imperatively needed, bombing planes, torpedo planes, and scout planes in large numbers will be necessary. A great flotilla of surface ships constituting an auxiliary fleet and the aerial and submarine vessels will cost hundreds of millions additional. More naval bases will be required, larger docks must be added, and hundreds of millions will be spent in harbors and upon naval bases for the protection of this great fleet which is to be created if the policy of the naval board is to continue unchallenged. I assert with the utmost confidence that the 1916 program, plus what will be imperatively needed to properly supplement it, including naval bases, yards, docks, and construction plants, will cost the United States more than \$1,500,000,000.

Already it is planned to construct at Alameda, Calif., a naval base, the cost of which will exceed \$100,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that there is a suitable base at Mare Island, upon which \$30,000,000 have been spent.

Nor is the chapter yet ended. According to the demands of the Navy Department, more than 120,000 officers and men are now required to man the ships already in use. When the naval program is completed at least 25,000 additional men will be required. This item alone will add to the naval budget tens of millions of dollars annually. At least 1,500 officers and men are required to properly man a capital ship. The requisitions of the Navy for the next fiscal year, for maintenance alone, amount to over \$500,000,000. It is safe therefore to assume that for the maintenance of the Navy after the completion of the 1916 program an annual expense will be entailed exceeding that stupendous sum. And still the chapter is not closed.

Vessels will become obsolete and tens of millions of dollars will be required annually to replace them. New types will be developed, and their construction will be demanded. A burden so staggering will not be submitted to, in my opinion, by the American people. It is to be noted that the completion of the 1916 building program, even by its projectors, promises no relief from further construction. We know that such a promise would be insincere and absolutely impossible of fulfillment. Indeed, the General Board desires at this time to supplement the 1916 program by adding thereto 3 battleships, 1 battle cruiser, 30 cruisers, 8 gunboats, 18 destroyers, 12 mine-laying submarines, 6 cruiser submarines, 4 airplane carriers, 3 destroyer tenders, and 3 submarine tenders, the cost of which would exceed \$600,000,000.

At this point let me say that I am not in favor of "scrapping the Navy"; nor do I support a "little Navy" policy. I believe that our Army should be reduced to the utmost possible limits, but that we should maintain a strong and efficient Navy; but I contend that the policy proposed ignores past experiences and commits the American people to an oppressive burden of taxation, and suggests a course that will subject this Government to criticism upon the part of other nations and to a distrust of our professions of friendship and international good will. Moreover, this projected naval policy will offer obstacles great, if not insuperable, to an agreement between the great powers to secure material reductions in armaments, military and naval, and to create an organization vital and potential in the interest of world peace and for the determination of international controversies.

In my opinion, the five battleships which are approaching completion should be finished. Work upon the remaining battleships, six in number, should be at once discontinued. One cruiser should be completed, but the construction of the remaining five should be suspended, if not wholly discontinued.

We have 300 destroyers. They are modern and the most effective vessels of their class in the world, and are entirely adequate for the present. A few submarines of the largest type are needed. At least one plane carrier, and possibly two, should be constructed within a reasonable time, together with the necessary complement of aircraft. Perhaps some additions of auxiliary craft should be made to the fleet. This program, in my opinion, should suffice for the present. I should add, however, that many of the vessels now on the Navy list should be immediately withdrawn from service.

If this plan were adopted there would be an immediate saving to the Government of between four hundred and fifty and five hundred millions of dollars. The ultimate saving would be very great, amounting to tens of millions of dollars annually. It would result in a reduction of the personnel of the Navy and would subtract tens of millions of dollars annually from the operating expenses of the Navy Department. The upkeep of these huge capital ships is at least \$3,000,000 per annum. The British estimate that the annual upkeep of the battle cruiser *Hood*, which is a smaller vessel than the capital ships projected in the 1916 program, is at least \$539,000 per annum.

The capital ships now being constructed are 860 feet in length, and their draft is so great that there are but few harbors wide and deep enough for them to enter. The fuel cost for the capital ships is enormous and the increasing scarcity of oil only adds to the already stupendous costs of operating a fleet of this character.

The 11 battleships now under construction may be divided into two classes, for the purpose of determining the percentage of completion. In the first class there are five vessels which range in state of completion from 44.5 to 95.5 per cent, the average state of which is 71.46 per cent. Four of these vessels, the *Colorado*, *Maryland*, *Washington*, and *West Virginia*, are being constructed in private yards, and the fifth, the *California*, which is nearly completed, is being constructed at the Mare Island Navy Yard. In the second class there are six battleships which range in state of completion from 1.2 to 22.3 per cent, the average of which is 15.53 per cent. Four of these vessels, the *South Dakota*, *Indiana*, *Montana*, and *North Carolina*, are being built in navy yards; the *Iowa* and *Massachusetts* in private yards. The *Iowa* is 13.1 per cent complete and the *Massachusetts* 1.2 per cent complete. The ultimate cost of these six battleships, which are less than 22.3 per cent complete, upon the basis of forty-five millions per unit, will be at least \$370,000,000.

As stated, the first group of battleships, consisting of the *California*, *Maryland*, *Colorado*, *Washington*, and *West Virginia*, should be completed. Work upon the second group of battleships should be suspended or discontinued. The average state of completion of the battle cruisers represents two and a fraction per cent of the cost, and the work upon the *Ranger* is only 1 per cent. My understanding is that the department in estimating the "state of completion" took into account materials on hand but not yet used; indeed, the contracts for a number of the ships have been but recently entered into and the keels of a number have not been laid. Work upon the cruiser *Saratoga*, which shows 13 per cent state of completion, should be continued, but, as stated, work upon the remaining five cruisers should be suspended.

The six battle cruisers are all of one type. They have a length of 550 feet, a beam of 101 feet 8½ inches, a mean draft of 31 feet, a displacement of 43,500 tons, engines of 180,000 horsepower, and an estimated speed of 33½ knots per hour. The battle cruisers are heavier than any of the 11 battleships under construction, although 6 of the battleships are to have a displacement of 43,200 tons, and 4 of 32,600 tons, and 1 of 32,300 tons. The engine power, however, of the cruisers is to be three times that of the heaviest battleships and more than six times that of the lesser battleships. It is apparent that the battleships, modern as they are, are far outranked in engine power, speed, and general effectiveness by the battle cruisers.

The keels of three of these battle cruisers were laid September 25, 1920, and one was laid in January, 1921. Of course, the purpose of the board is to construct a navy designed to be the greatest and most powerful in the world regardless of cost or of world conditions. The British Navy has but one vessel of the large battle cruiser type, namely, the *Hood*, which was launched in 1919; it has a displacement of 41,200 tons and is 2,300 tons less than that of the projected American battle cruisers.

The armament of the *Hood* consists of eight 15-inch guns; whereas, the armament of our projected battle cruisers is to be eight 16-inch guns. The speed of the *Hood* is 31.5 knots, and the speed of the American battle cruisers is estimated to be 33.25. The British have five other so-called battle cruisers, but they were launched between 1911 and 1916. Their displacement is only 26,500 tons and they carry eight 13½-inch guns. I might add that the British program, devised just before the war, included the construction of four ships of the *Hood* type, and the keels of all were laid. At the end of the war, the British Admiralty "scrapped" the three keels, notwithstanding \$8,170,000 had been expended in work upon them. This action was taken deliberately by the British Admiralty. Undoubtedly their position was influenced, if not controlled, by the experiences and lessons of the war. Yet in the face of the position of the British Admiralty, the Navy Department and General Board insist upon the construction of six battle cruisers exceeding the *Hood* in displacement, engine power, armament, and speed.

On the basis that these battle cruisers are to have an ultimate cost of \$45,000,000, their present average state of completion represents an average outlay of \$2,376,000 each. It is altogether likely that the actual outlay is not nearly so great as indicated. The act of 1916 fixed the limit of cost on these cruisers, exclusive of armaments, at \$16,500,000. Upon this basis the average state of completion of 5.28 per cent would indicate an average outlay upon each vessel of \$87,120.

It is assumed, moreover, that the figures submitted by the Navy Department showing the state of completion of each vessel refer to the completion of the hull and do not include the installation of the armament of the ship; and yet in the face of the fact that the British Admiralty scrapped the keels of three battle cruisers upon which there was an average outlay of \$2,733,333 each, the General Board is laying the keels and is proceeding with the construction of six battle cruisers, and insist that there shall be no suspension of work, although the money actually laid out is much less than that expended upon the British vessels.

Another fact should be taken into account in determining whether there should be a suspension of active work under the 1916 program. The cost of construction is very much greater now than it will be within the next two or three years. The contracts let for their construction are based upon the high levels established during and immediately after the war. These high cost levels operate as a disturbing factor in all industrial circles. They are impediments to economic readjustments and obstacles to a return to sound and just business and economic conditions.

The contracts are under the cost-plus plan, a system which has proven in practice to make for waste and extravagance. It would be the part of wisdom, in my opinion, to suspend work upon all of the ships under construction, except the ones to which I have above referred, nor should contracts be let for the construction of those which I have indicated as necessary for the Navy until conditions in our industrial life have materially changed.

It will be, of course, contended that a suspension of work upon the program will involve a considerable loss. The majority report of the committee states that the material loss from a six months' suspension upon the program would be between \$15,000,000 and \$25,000,000. Admiral Taylor in his testimony supported this view.

Admiral Coontz, when asked what the cost would be if construction were suspended, stated:

"I would have to figure on that, but the contracts have been let and some of the big concerns throughout the country are going ahead and the stuff is pouring in, and the greatest loss would be in the holding up of the contracts. That would have a very great effect. I understand that a number of our biggest concerns are practically depending on these to tide them over until they get more work, but that would be probably the principal effect of it."

This statement is exceedingly interesting. It has been repeatedly charged that munitions factories and steel corporations and plants engaged in building war vessels were behind programs calling for military armaments and big navies. We know that in Germany the Krupp and the manufacturers of steel and war munitions were the most active propagandists in favor of imperialism and world power and mighty armaments and big navies. It is needless to say that the influence of these corporations and those controlling these huge industrial concerns were largely responsible for German militarism and the imperialistic policies of the German Empire; but they came to grief and brought their country to ruin.

We are told now that a number of our "big concerns" are practically "dependent" on these naval contracts. I confess that this reasoning does not commend itself to my approval. These concerns are constructing ships which were to have cost but sixteen and one-half millions (without armament) at a present cost of forty-five millions each, including armament. Their interest, of course, is very great in the execution of the 1916 program. It means undoubtedly millions of dollars profit to the shipbuilders and the armament makers and the steel plants of the United States. Within comparatively few years the cost of battleships has been advanced from \$320 to \$1,000 per ton.

I submit that even if a suspension of construction of the entire program would result in a loss of \$25,000,000, the gains would be very much greater. In the first place, the cost of construction at a later period would be materially diminished. Within a year it should be reduced from 25 to 50 per cent. A suspension of work upon the entire program for six months, even if work were then resumed upon every ship, would save the Government, in my opinion, considerably more than \$100,000,000. A number of the ships, it will be remembered, are being constructed in Government yards and the loss there from a suspension of work would be unimportant.

Again referring to the cost of maintaining our Navy, attention is called to the estimates, or rather the requisitions for the fiscal year 1922. These requisitions cover maintenance, exclusive of appropriations for new construction, and amount to \$495,515,731.47, and in addition thereto requisitions for the civil establishments of the Navy in the amount of \$3,050,040, and requisitions for "permanent annual and indefinite appropriations" of \$13,197,696, making an aggregate of \$511,763,764.47. In other words, merely for the maintenance of the Navy we are asked to appropriate over half a billion of dollars for the coming year. The amount asked for current construction upon the 1916 program for the next fiscal year is \$184,000,000.

The cost of maintaining capital ships now in course of construction is enormous. The indicated horsepower of the six battle cruisers alone aggregates 1,080,000 horsepower, to be produced by the consumption of oil. This in itself is a frightful waste when we consider that the total hydraulic power developed at Niagara Falls, both on the American and Canadian sides of the river, aggregates 697,000 horsepower, and the total potential horsepower at Muscle Shoals, Ala., is 100,000 horsepower primary, and 350,000 horsepower secondary. Millions of money have been expended to produce 697,000 horsepower at Niagara Falls which would otherwise flow to waste, and yet the Navy proposes to expend hundreds of millions of dollars to construct battleships, six of which alone will consume 1,080,000 horsepower, which will not be reproduced in money or goods, but will be utterly wasted, at least in the economic and industrial sense.

The Federal Government has expended but \$1,000,000,000 in rivers and harbors from the foundation of the Government until the present time. The great inland waterways and the enormous harbors, important and so essential to our commerce, have received but \$1,000,000,000 in more than 130 years. We have expended upon our Navy more than \$6,500,000,000 since 1884, and now are asked to assume a burden of from 500 to 750 or 800 millions of dollars for immediate naval construction and a continuing burden of hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the maintenance and development of our naval power.

It might be interesting to know that 16 first-class battleships completed between 1910 and 1917 cost but \$167,611,692, and that the 23 battleships completed from 1895 to 1908 cost but \$139,222,541; and the cost of all wars in all lands from 1793 to 1860 was but a little over \$9,000,000,000.

LESSONS OF THE WAR AND WORLD CONDITIONS NOT PROPERLY APPRAISED BY MAJORITY REPORT.

As I have shown, the report of the General Board is primarily a defense of the capital ship and fails, in my opinion, to properly appreciate what the Navy of the future should be. The board seem to proceed upon the theory that the outstanding lesson of the war is that the capital ship is and will continue to be the paramount naval force. I submit that facts have led naval experts as well as students of naval strategy to a different conclusion. It seems manifest that in any aspect of the case there should be further consideration given to a question so important as that involved in determining our future naval policy. It would not only be supreme folly but it would be a wrong to expend hundreds of millions of dollars, wrung from the people by taxation, for the construction and maintenance of war vessels which were obsolete before the keels were laid.

Lord Fisher, as is well known, is the father of the dreadnaught, and that type of vessel was regarded as the highest type of naval construction. That was followed by the superdreadnaught, and the types of 5 and 10 years ago are found to be imperfect and vulnerable to the forces now brought into naval contests. Lord Fisher saw that the submarine and aircraft would revolutionize naval warfare, and in September, 1919, wrote these words:

"Flying dominates future war both by land and sea. It is not my business to discuss the land, but at sea the only way to avoid the air is to get under the water, so you are driven to the internal-combustion engine and oil. That is why I keep on emphasizing that the whole navy has to be scrapped."

Admiral Von Scheer, who commanded the German fleet at the Battle of Jutland, has submitted views which weaken the position of the General Board and call for a revision of their action and of the policy announced in the report of the committee. Admiral Von Scheer, in substance, states that the cost of surface ships is enormous and yet "they are very vulnerable"; that a great surface fleet can no longer protect a coast or overseas commerce; that only a few nations in the past could afford big ships and this resulted in their ruling the sea, but that the submarine has "knocked all this into a cocked hat, and fear of the British fleet as a fighting weapon has gone"; that "submarines can best defend or attack a coast and can best protect or destroy commerce"; and that an adequate submarine navy would enable a comparatively weak nation to pursue an overseas policy "without worrying about a surface fleet." Admiral Von Scheer is competent to speak upon this vital question. He knows how impotent the German high fleet was in the great World War and also the great achievement wrought for Germany by the submarine.

Capt. Hart, who has carefully studied the operations of the German submarines, states that not more than 10,000 officers and men were employed during the entire war in the submarine fleets, and that, as a rule, not more than 30 submarines were at sea at one time, manned by approximately 1,500 men. As opposed to this small force and the impounded German high fleet were more than 1,000,000 men of the allied naval forces, together with the fleets of the allied nations including between four and five thousand small craft whose activities were of the highest importance. Notwithstanding this great disproportion in forces, Germany nearly won the war, and if it had not been for the intervention of the United States, would have triumphed. Great Britain's grand fleet was unable to protect itself against submarines, and she was compelled, in feverish haste, to employ her great resources to construct submarines and destroyers and various devices against the insidious and powerful enemy. The capital ship was safe only when locked in protected harbors. Can there be any doubt but that Germany would have won the war if her submarine fleet had numbered 200 instead of 40 when the war began? In my opinion, England's mighty fleet would have been powerless in the face of so formidable a foe, and the currents of history would have been changed and the map of Europe written by the Central Empires.

We are told that immediately after the arrival of Admiral Sims in England he reported the dangerous situation of the Allies, and that Germany was winning the war. We have not forgotten the reports that came from overseas during the dark days of 1917 and 1918, showing that the allied nations were losing from 500,000 to 800,000 tons of shipping per month. It was felt then that the submarine was a powerful foe, which not only destroyed the merchant ships but war vessels that were supposed to be monarchs of the sea.

Lord Rothmere, formerly director of England's air forces, in a recent article entitled "The folly of big battleships," has stated that "Great Britain can not afford to spend money on naval construction at present," and that "they [referring to the United States and Japan] are obviously building against each other and not against us." He refers to the capital ships being constructed by the United States and Japan as inadequate forms in warfare and declares that our conduct in constructing them "is no proof that capital ships will survive." He further states that "no nation henceforth will enjoy naval supremacy—it is a nasty pill, and we must swallow it."

It is well known that the British Admiralty has discontinued the construction of capital ships. Following the armistice, three battle cruisers were scrapped by Great Britain, though the keels had been laid and an average outlay of nearly \$3,000,000 had been made upon each. I appreciate the fact that some will contend that Great Britain's finances prevented her from building further expensive war vessels. However, when we recall the views of Lord Fisher and other British naval experts who have, in effect, condemned the capital ship because of the development of the submarine and aerial warships, we should pause and make searching investigation to determine what course prudence and wisdom dictate.

Sir Percy Scott is recognized as a naval inventor of international standing and a man of courage and ability. His inventions have contributed to the success of dreadnaughts, and his own naval career enable him to appreciate the strength and the weakness of those fighting vessels. He takes the view announced by Lord Fisher before his death, and he recently said:

"The introduction of the vessels that swim under water has, in my opinion, entirely done away with the utility of the ships that swim on the top of the water. The submarine causes to disappear three out of five of the functions, defensive and offensive, of a vessel of war, as no man-of-war will dare to come even within sight of a coast that is adequately protected by submarines."

"With a flotilla of submarines I would undertake to get into any harbor and sink or materially damage all the ships in that harbor. If by submarines we close the egress of the North Sea and Mediterranean, it is difficult to see how our commerce can be much interfered with."

Sir Percy Scott has openly opposed the building of additional battleships and declared in favor of smaller craft. In a recent letter, published in the London Evening Standard, he says that it is not to be expected that naval officers would oppose the building of battleships, because if they did "they would commit professional suicide."

He further declares that the British learned the following lessons from the war:

"That if Germany had possessed more submarines at the beginning of the war they would have won, and that the weapons that nearly defeated the Allies were the mine and the torpedo. The foremost of the British battleships in the Mediterranean were sunk, and that after the appearance of the submarine in that sea the British battleships which had not been sent to the bottom did very little useful work. The British battleships could not get through the Dardanelles. They were stopped by the mines and not by battleships. Our leviathan battleships in the North Sea did not bombard any of the enemies' fortifications or seaport towns or harbors. Assaults can hide themselves by smoke screens. What is probably the most effective weapon against battleships was not employed during the war—the airplane with a torpedo. This new device can attack battleships both at sea and in harbors. It is not safe alone, and must have nurses in the form of airplanes and surface vessels to keep down submarines."

He further states that the British could not protect their commerce on sea, and that in a war between a country with a long coast line and battleships for defense and another country with a large number of submarines the latter country within an hour after hostilities were declared would dispatch them to trade routes, where they would be guided and advised by hydroplanes of the whereabouts of merchant vessels to be destroyed. He also states that aircraft would drop torpedoes on battleships, while the submarines would be planting mines at harbor entrances, and that under such circumstances no armada would dare to pass five days at sea.

In a recent article he reviews the work of Great Britain's Grand Fleet during the recent war and calls attention to the fact that during substantially the entire period of the war she was locked up in harbors and was unable to attack the enemy's coast or to remain at sea. It is true she made a few furtive visits to the North Sea, but only after she had ascertained by means of aircraft, scout vessels, and otherwise that attacks from submarines and destroyers were not imminent. And, in addition to these precautions, she was guarded by a flotilla of smaller craft, including submarines, destroyers, and naval airplanes. The few submarines which the Central Empires maintained in the Mediterranean Sea rendered the battleships of Great Britain and France of but little value and seriously impeded both the land and naval operations of the allied forces.

Admiral Fullam, one of the most eminent men of our Navy, has strongly opposed the completion of the 1916 program. His testimony before the committee is illuminating and a strong contribution to the question under consideration. In his testimony Admiral Fullam quotes from page 21 of Admiral Sims' recent work, in which the latter refers to the conditions existing on the English coast in April, 1917, when the navy of Great Britain, supported by the navies of France, Italy, and Japan, might have been supposed to command the sea, because the German Fleet was blockaded. Admiral Sims states:

"It was not until the spring of 1917 that we really awoke to the actual situation; it was not until I had spent several days in England that I made the all-important discovery, which was this—that Britain did not control the seas. She still controlled the seas in the old Nelsonian sense; that is, her Grand Fleet successfully 'contained' the German battle squadrons and kept them, for the greater part of the war, penned up in their German harbors. In the old days such a display of sea power would have easily won the war for the Allies. But that is not control of the seas in the modern sense; it is merely the control of the surface of the seas. Under modern methods of naval warfare sea control means far more than controlling the top of the water. For there is another type of ship, which sails stealthily under the waves, revealing its presence only at certain intervals, and capable of shooting a terrible weapon which can sink the proudest surface ship in a few minutes."

"The existence of this new type of warship makes control of the seas to-day a very different thing from what it was in Nelson's time. As long as such a warship can operate under the water almost at will—and this was the case in a considerable area of the ocean in the early part of 1917—it is ridiculous to say that any navy controls the seas. For this submarine vessel, when used as successfully as it was used by the Germans in 1917, deprives the surface navy of that advantage which has proved most decisive in other wars. That is, the surface navy can no longer completely protect communication as it could protect in Nelson's and Farragut's times. It no longer guarantees a belligerent its food, its munitions, its raw materials of manufacture and commerce, or the free movement of its troops. It is obviously absurd to say that a belligerent which was losing 800,000 or 900,000 tons of shipping a month, as was the case with the Allies in the spring of 1917, was the undisputed mistress of the seas. Had the German submarine campaign continued to succeed at this rate the United States could not have transported its army to France, and the food and materials which we were sending to Europe, and which were essential to winning the war, could never have crossed the ocean."

The submarine at that time had not reached the standard of efficiency subsequently attained, nor had the naval air force assumed the great importance which it did before the end of the war. Admiral Fullam refers to the fact that the Grand Fleet, to which seven of our battleships from the United States were attached, "did not chase or combat the submarines that were starving England, because they could not." They remained in port "waiting for the battle that never came; the sea meanwhile was controlled by other forces." He further states that "had the Navy Department intelligently anticipated our entrance into the World War it could best have prepared by stopping the 1916 program even earlier—yes, before it was ever outlined and concentrated upon destroyers and small craft to combat the enemy which the department had been watching for two years, in the deadly work of 'controlling the sea.' And now, in 1921, four years later, the Navy Department again goes back to the 1916 program which did not provide ships to fight against Germany. It proposes to double the number of ships that could not fight submarines then, and can not fight them now. One could imagine that submarines had been abolished. But they still exist—though not in our Navy in the numbers required to control the sea."

The admiral suggests that it would be interesting to consider what England's course would have been if Germany's fleet had been destroyed at the battle of Jutland. He states that in that event neither England's dreadnaughts nor those of the United States would have searched the sea for submarines, nor would they have been assigned the duty of escorting merchant vessels and transports.

"Had they gone to sea, would they not have been compelled to take with them, for their own salvation, the protecting screen of cruisers and destroyers that are most efficient in combating the submarine? From this it is not manifest that the wisest thing to have done would have been to lock England's battleships as well as our own safely in protected harbors, and then set free about 100 destroyers and many cruisers that were needed to save England from starvation?"

Admiral Fullam asks that consideration be given all the facts referred to in his testimony, and then asks whether we shall "blindly adhere to the 1916 program without reservations—a program, a child, born during the battle of Jutland, we might say, ignores the awful events that followed its birth and continues to live in comparative indifference to the daily lessons and teachings of the past five years."

The Gallipoli campaign revealed the weakness of battleships in efforts to reduce fortifications and in attempts to land and support invading forces, and, as Admiral Fullam says, at the same time "it demonstrates the vital necessity for submarines and aircraft, both in landing and in repelling landing."

Rear Admiral Taylor, chief constructor of the Navy, in an article recently published by the Franklin Institute, states: "Although we must conclude that the present tendency is toward increased size and cost, one can not overlook the fact that this very tendency, under the present financial, economic, and political conditions in the world, may actually result, in the long run, in the disappearance from building programs of these very types, and the substitution for them of smaller and cheaper units made possible by new developments in science and engineering." The admiral states that there is great need for "imagination and vision" on the part of the fighting forces afloat and the naval designers ashore, for that nation which can develop weapons which will render obsolete the present great ships and can substitute for them a smaller and cheaper unit, capable of defeating them, will win, in the new era, command of the seas which this war has shown is so important to ultimate victory. I submit, that "vision" and the proper application of the lessons of the war must lead to the conclusion that there will be a disappearance from view of building programs of these very types (capital ships) and the substitution for them of smaller and cheaper units. The General Board needs "vision" and the courage to apply the demonstrated facts which the World War revealed.

The British Admiralty seems to possess this "vision" and the courage to oppose a construction program which is oppressive financially and at best uncertain as to its utility.

I have not considered what the war and recent accomplishments have taught us concerning the value of torpedo planes and other aircraft in naval warfare. The evidence relating to this matter is voluminous and convincing. I can only refer to a few points in support of the proposition, that the General Board has failed to properly appraise the value of naval aircraft and is imprudent in so tenaciously adhering to the 1916 naval program. Admiral Sims in testifying before the Senate Naval Committee stated that one of the first things to be done is "to develop the airplanes, which means also aero-carrying ships." He refers to the fact that the advocates of the aerotorpedo claim that they can drop "a torpedo successfully in the water and that it will run successfully; that they can carry a torpedo of the ordinary type for 10,000 yards, and that planes can be built to carry two or three more"; and he further states that they are doing it now, and they are doing it successfully. He mentions the fact that planes are now in use that will carry 6,000 pounds of bombs, each shell containing 500 pounds of high explosives, and that one of these things dropped on the deck of a ship would penetrate through the deck and would destroy her as a battleship.

He also discusses the danger or the possibility of airplanes being interfered with in their operations against surface war vessels and states that—

"It would require about 1,000 shots from the ships for every hit to make, which is about one-tenth of 1 per cent. The admiral referred to recent experiments conducted by the Navy. Bombs were dropped from a height of 4,000 feet against the battleship *Indiana* and 9 per cent of the hits were made on the hull of the vessel, whereas 20 or 30 per cent of the hits were within an area 'that would have been destructive to the vessel, because a bomb that is dropped in the water will explode the same as if it struck, and if it is within 60 feet of the hull of the ship it would drive the plates in.'"

He also states that the difficulty of hitting a moving vessel, compared to one at anchor, is unimportant on account of the great speed of the airplane. The admiral states that—

"you are practically wasting time to try to hit an airplane which can cruise 10,000 feet in the air, outside of gunfire. He lunges down and is on the water, lets go his torpedo, and he is away. They have successfully torpedoed a single ship that way."

Speaking of the importance of the airplane development, Admiral Sims said:

"It normally adds to the ability of a country to defend itself. No battleship afloat can operate against the coast of an enemy, within the range of the enemy's airplanes, for this reason. A fleet that goes over there, whether it has 6 or 8 or 10 airplane carriers, suppose it has 10—that would be nearly 1,000 planes. With 30 planes each, it would be 300 airplanes coming up against the coast where we are operating from the beach and we have 2,000 airplanes. It simply means that you are controlling the air absolutely and you will wipe out all of the air force, and you will be perfectly free to attack that fleet."

He also refers to the fact that distance is an obstacle in warfare, so that—

"Great Britain with all her forces could not attack this coast without a base on this side to operate from. She has not a single ship that can come across the ocean and get back again, let alone stay here without assistance."

Admiral Sims' testimony is instructive as to the value of airplanes in naval warfare, and in my opinion supports the view that the capital ship of the future will be the airplane carrier, and that the warships employed in the air will deprive the surface ships, including the mighty dreadnaughts, of their formidable character. The war teaches in an impressive way that the battleship unprotected and undefended by submarines and torpedo boats and aircraft will be of but slight utility in the naval contests of the future. Admiral Sims emphasizes the necessity of converting some scout cruisers into airplane carriers, and approves of the construction of two carriers of great speed. He explains the value of airplanes not only for attacks upon the sea but also for coast defense and offensive movements by attacking naval forces. It seems clear from the lessons taught by the war that no fleet can successfully operate upon the sea, or in attacks upon land, without naval airplanes; indeed, the modern navy must operate on three planes—the surface, above the surface, and beneath the surface. And as Admiral Fullam states:

"These forces must exist in due proportion and must be coordinated strategically and tactically to win a modern battle. The navy which lacks forces on the lower and upper planes will be seriously menaced. A one-plane navy can not win against a three-plane navy. The Navy of the United States to-day is practically a one-plane navy. The minds of many naval officers and legislators are fixed upon one, or, at most, two planes."

The General Board, it would seem, have been so zealous in urging the unmodified program of 1915, which is the capital ship program, that they have not sufficiently emphasized the construction of submarines (not only for coastal defense purposes, but for naval offensive warfare), and also torpedo planes and other forms of aircraft. One admiral in his testimony sought to minimize the effect of bombs dropped from airplanes, and describes the damage in the experiments against the *Indiana* as "purely local." The evidence is contradictory of his statement, and the accumulated data incontrovertibly establishes the destructiveness of bombs and torpedoes dropped from the skies. In a recent sham battle between the Grand Fleet and the Royal Air Force, in Portland Roads (England), the attack was made by seven airplanes carrying torpedoes, and six direct hits were scored out of the seven torpedoes used. Mr. C. J. Gray, one of the foremost English aeronautical writers, and editor of the *Aeroplane*, of London, states that the airplanes were—

"preceded by two bombers which flew at about 10,000 feet, where, of course, the sailorman had neither heard nor seen them. Instead of dropping bombs the bombers dropped a string of smoke bombs about a mile to the windward of the fleet. Before the smoke cleared away, and before the fleet had a chance to use a gun, the torpedo machines came through the smoke down wind at about 130 miles an hour, so low down and so fast that no earthly naval gun would have had a chance of hitting any of them. It is practically certain that, given an adequate force of torpedo aircraft, no hostile fleet could come within 100 miles of any coast so defended."

He further states that, in his opinion—

"the capital ship of the future will be a very big, high-speed aircraft carrier, which will use torpedo airplanes instead of long-range guns, and otherwise will be equipped with what is now considered secondary armament for use against hostile airplanes and against submarines to repel torpedo droppers."

Admiral Sims states the case for the airplane carrier in this language:

"The whole point is this. Anybody that decides that the battleship is always going to remain the capital ship and that the airplane carrier is never going to become a capital ship has got to accept this proposition, that American ingenuity is not capable of improving a torpedo so that it can be dropped from a height of 30 feet without injury."

On the 1st of February, Gen. William Mitchell, assistant chief of the Air Service of the United States Army, testified before the House committee on the naval appropriation bill. His testimony covers the entire field of aerial operations and strongly supports the contention that the battleship as a fighting force is menaced by airplanes. He declares that "airplane carriers will supplant battleships." First, after that, battle cruisers, and that the logical attack will be carriers protected by a small form of destroyer. He refers to the fact that England is proceeding "with the development of her aviation, and that if the United States neglects the air forces we will be at a great disadvantage." He states that we have bombs capable of "demolishing or putting out of action not only all auxiliary ships, but capital ships as well," and that with these bombs, as distinguished from projectiles fired out of cannon, "we have a greater per cent of hits over 20,000 yards than have cannon projectiles."

The *Scientific American* of August 14, 1920, presents a view that is worthy of attention. This statement is made:

"We believe that in future war the torpedo will at least come into its own, and it will be the internal-combustion engine that will work the change. It gave us the motor car and the airplane, and now it is, perhaps, destined to dethrone the battleship and battle cruiser as the supreme elements of naval strength. But how? Well, the British have several large and fast torpedo plane carriers. Let us forecast a duel between a 12-gun, 23-knot *Muscleback* and a 32-knot torpedo-plane carrier, with twice that number of planes aboard. Steaming outside of 16-inch gun range, the carrier would send in her planes, which, swooping down from great height at 150 miles would drop their torpedoes within close range and return for more. But the bulge will save the ship? No; for the torpedoes will be set to pass underneath the ship, and they will be fired magnetically by the action of the steel mass of the ship itself, and you could not put side and bottom bulges both upon a ship—she would be all bulge and but little ship."

In the issue of January 1, 1921, the same journal contains this statement:

"The need for going slow on new construction, especially of capital ships, is the more apparent when we remember that the European nations, including Great Britain, have laid down no capital ships and practically no warships of any kind for the past two years. Partly is this due to financial stringency; but unquestionably—at least, in the case of Great Britain—it is due also to the recognition of the formidable part which war in the air is destined to play in future naval warfare, particularly as a means of attack with large masses of explosive carried to the battleship in the form of close-up torpedo attack or the delivery of deck-piercing bombs carrying enormous charges."

The *Scientific American* of February 12, 1921, contains this statement:

"That very small minority in our Navy Department which would like to see the United States spend about \$1,000,000,000 in building 'incomparably the most powerful fleet in the world' has endeavored to give the impression that a great naval shipbuilding competition is in progress between the other leading navies and ourselves. Now, as regards the British Navy, this is absolutely untrue. If there be any naval race, we have the course entirely to ourselves, for Great Britain is doing no new shipbuilding whatsoever, and relatively to our own fleet that of Great Britain is not so powerful as it was before the war. To be clear upon this point, let us consider the past seven years and the losses of the British by war and by the breaking up and sale of ships since the armistice."

"During the war Great Britain lost out of her fighting fleet over 600,000 tons, or two-thirds as much tonnage as there was in the United States fleet in 1914. The facts regarding this tremendous depletion of her navy are to be found in a pamphlet published by our Office of Naval Intelligence, entitled 'Information concerning the United States Navy and other navies.' From this we learned that her losses by mine, submarine, shell fire, and other causes were as follows: Three battle cruisers, including the super battle cruiser *Queen Mary* (63,000 tons); 13 battleships, including the 23,000-ton dreadnaught *Audacious* and the

19,250-ton dreadnaught *Vanguard* (201,000 tons); 10 armored cruisers (151,000 tons); 9 light cruisers (51,500 tons); 6 monitors (8,125 tons); 67 destroyers (50,500 tons); 52 submarines (37,000 tons); and 22 sloops (26,000 tons); the total, including other smaller craft, is over 600,000 tons. Added to these was a loss of 37 merchant auxiliaries, including many ships of from 12,000 to 18,000 tons, which brings the total loss to nearly three-quarters of a million tons.

"To make good these losses, and to keep pace with the demands of the war, she took in hand a large program of new construction. But when victory was assured and the world menace of the German fleet had been removed, all outstanding contracts were canceled, except in the case of certain vessels of the smaller types that were near completion; and a large number of ships, including three sister ships to the 42,000-ton battle cruiser *Hood*, were broken up on the spot and sold as junk. As a matter of fact, it is some seven and one-half years since the British Admiralty laid down a battleship, and of light craft not one has been ordered since the fall of 1918."

"Furthermore, in agreement with her conviction that the war was indeed over and a period of peace and reduction of armaments was at hand, Great Britain struck off her active list practically the whole of her big fleet of prewar dreadnaught battleships, her armored cruisers, her protected cruisers, and a large number of destroyers, submarines, and other smaller craft, the list totaling about 150 ships that were either retired, sold, or broken up. Not only this, but she has tentatively condemned all of her capital ships that are armed with guns of 12-inch caliber or less; and although she has still on the list 26 dreadnaught battleships, several of these that are armed with a 12-inch gun are in reserve or have been delegated to minor duties as practice ships, gun-training ships, etc."

"Another point, which is perhaps the most significant of all and one which will be fully appreciated by all naval men, is that in her whole fleet there is only one ship, the *Hood*, which embodies in its construction and arrangements the enormous amount of technical information gleaned from the Battle of Jutland, information which was loyally passed on to the experts of her ally, the United States."

"Had she gone ahead with her program as we have done, she would have to-day in her fleet three additional ships of the *Hood* class; her fleet of light cruisers would have been greatly increased; and she would have added over 100 ships to her fleet of destroyers and submarines, all of these vessels embodying the lessons of the war and particularly those of the Jutland engagement."

These views are shared by eminent naval experts and by men who have given profound thought to the question of naval preparedness. In my opinion they establish not merely a *prima facie* case but an incontestable one against the wisdom of the policy suggested by the General Board. This is the day of the undersea and air destroying forces. If we are to maintain a big Navy, its strength will lie in the air and in the undersea and submersible vessels; not alone in capital ships.

DOES THE UNITED STATES REQUIRE A NAVY OF THE CHARACTER CONTEMPLATED BY THE GENERAL BOARD?

The Secretary of the Navy in his annual report, December 1, 1920 (p. 217), stated there were in the Naval Establishment of the United States, fit for service on that date, 795 vessels of the following descriptions:

Battleships	37
Armored cruisers	8
Monitors	6
Cruisers	24
Destroyers	249
Submarines	98
Gunboats	19
Patrol boats	55
Converted yachts	10
Submarine chasers	112
Tugs and mine sweepers	86
Fuel ships	22
Other auxiliaries	46
Vessels unserviceable for war	23

The Secretary also reported as under construction 165 vessels of various types, which upon their completion would bring the total number of vessels of all descriptions in the Navy up to 960, with an aggregate tonnage of 2,910,316, and an aggregate horsepower of 12,865,897. The elimination from our construction program of 500,000 tons of battleships and battle cruisers will leave us a Navy of 2,400,000 tons, which ought not to be a "little" Navy even in the estimation of the big Navy men.

It is conceded that some of the naval vessels of the United States referred to by the Secretary are obsolete, if not obsolete, and it is quite likely that our Navy should be strengthened by the construction of airplanes and larger submarines, if not other types of war craft. If a satisfactory agreement is not entered into between the United States and the leading nations of the world for either complete or partial disarmament. In a statement before the House Committee on Naval Affairs on the 12th of January, 1921, the Secretary of the Navy stated that at the present time the British Navy has a total tonnage of effective fighting ships of 1,588,442, the Navy of the United States a total tonnage of effective fighting ships of 779,193, and Japan's navy a total tonnage of effective fighting ships of 340,596. From this statement it appears that our Navy now has more than double the tonnage of the Japanese Navy and we have more than half the tonnage of the British Navy in effective fighting ships. It is also known that Great Britain, as stated by the writer in the *Scientific American*, practically scrapped hundreds of her ships.

If the United States were to complete the various projects for new constructions now contemplated by the Navy, the total tonnage for the United States would exceed the tonnage of Great Britain's war vessels and would be more than double Japan's tonnage unless the incomplete construction plan of Japan shall be perfected and realized. While Great Britain has 46 battleships, only 29 are of the dreadnaught type. The United States, upon the completion of the 5 battleships which are now more than 70 per cent advanced, will have 42 battleships, at least 21 of which will be equal to, if not superior, to any ships in the world. Japan has 10 battleships; France, 17; Italy, 9; Argentina, 2; Brazil, 1; Chile, 1; Spain, 3; Greece, 2; Germany has 6 second-class battleships; Peru, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland have no battleships, but have naval craft of minor descriptions; and Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Persia, Rumania, Siam, Uruguay, and Venezuela have no effective ships of war of any description, either built or being built.

What is the reason, then, for this feverish haste to impose upon the American people further burdens for naval armament? Europe is exhausted financially and otherwise. Even the most clamorous and strident for a powerful American Navy must admit that there is not a

single power of Europe which menaces us, nor could a combination of all the powers of Europe imperil the United States either upon land or upon sea. I freely admit that Great Britain's Navy is stronger than ours, but even if Great Britain were our enemy and engaged in war against us, her navy, powerful as it is, would be impotent against our coasts. The United States has a superior torpedo-destroyer flotilla, and with the development of the submarine, the torpedo, mines, and airplanes, not only for coast defense but for combat at sea, it would be impossible for Great Britain to successfully operate against our coasts or to land troops upon our shores. The testimony of Admiral Sims, as well as the views of the greatest naval experts of the world, confirm that view. Of course, it is obvious that Japan is less able to attack our coasts than is Great Britain.

The nations of Europe are not building war vessels. They are trying to satisfy their hunger and meet the ravages of disease and restore order in distracted and suffering countries. They want peace, not war; bread and meat and clothing and medicines and an opportunity for work and production. They are building no battleships; and aside from the bolsheviks of Russia, they are seeking no conflicts. Military ambitions are dead and the prostrate peoples of Europe are looking to America not for bombs and bullets and war but for food and clothing and our surplus commodities, and for material help and aid in their distracted and tragic situation. When this Nation was assailed by Germany and the cause of civilization was imperiled, we cast our lot with the Entente Allies and with them battled in a common cause until the right triumphed. During that great contest, as well as since, we have exhibited in many ways our deep sympathy for the peoples of Europe and have manifested a sincere desire for their welfare. They are not plotting against us. Even the defeated nations are seeking the friendship of the American people. Great Britain desires no war with the United States, nor with any nation. It would be absolutely impossible for her to wage war against the United States.

Naval experts who are fair and honest are compelled to admit the impossibility of the United States encountering any danger at the hands of Great Britain. Admiral Sims in his testimony before the Senate committee stated in substance that we needed no coast defenses other than for the protection of our naval bases. The development of aerial warfare, the submarines, the mines, and the torpedo boats, make invasion of this country from the sea absolutely impossible. Not even the wildest jingoes dare to express a fear of invasion by land of the United States from the north or from the south. Against whom shall we arm? Against what power shall we continue to build giant navies, at a cost of hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars?

It would be cruel to even intimate that there is any apprehension from the Latin Republics. The United States entertains a deep and lasting affection for the republics to the south of us. Their welfare and development has been a matter of deep solicitude upon the part of the United States. The Monroe doctrine was promulgated as a shield against imperial ambitions of despotic European powers. We desire the friendship of the people of Mexico and Central and South America. It is the sincere desire of the people of this Republic that they shall be bound in amity and good will to the peoples of the vigorous and splendid Republics upon this hemisphere.

We turn to Asia. What foe have we there? And against whom shall we marshal our great resources and build a still more powerful Navy? China entertains not only respect but deep affection for this Republic. The Chauvinistic elements in the land are endeavoring to sow the seeds of discord and to provoke war between the United States and Japan. Writers, political orators, powerful magazines and newspapers seek to inflame the public mind against the Japanese Empire and to induce the belief that war between the United States and that far-away people is at our very door. It would seem that there are those in our midst who are intriguing and plotting for the purpose of destroying peace and amity now existing between this Republic and Japan and between this Republic and Great Britain. In my opinion, these intrigues will fail. War between the United States and Great Britain is unthinkable. It would not only be a tragedy, it would be a calamity—a catastrophe so overwhelming that no one but the most insensate and calloused could regard it except with horror. Why should Great Britain desire war with the United States? She covets none of our territory, nor do we covet hers. She has been benefited by our commerce and her trade has been important in our development. Great Britain has been our best customer and has absorbed our surplus commodities to the value of hundreds of millions, indeed, billions, of dollars annually.

Japan respected her treaty with Great Britain and joined with the Entente Allies against the Central Empires. Though of the Orient, she has absorbed much of the spirit of the Occident and has exhibited qualities that entitle her to be regarded as one of the leading nations of the earth. Upon a little island thousands of miles from our shore she seeks only the welfare of her people and opportunity for growth and development. Her birth rate of between six and seven hundred thousand per annum compels her statesmen to seek fields for legitimate territorial expansion. Asia lies before her and at her door; to Asia she will turn. She seeks no conquest upon this hemisphere, and in my opinion sincerely desires the good will and friendship of this Nation as well as of all other nations of the earth. Japan is burdened with debt and possesses but few resources and limited national wealth.

The imprudent, not to say irrational and menacing, talk upon the part of some Americans is calculated to impress her people with the thought that we entertain hostile designs against them and other nations. In 1904 Japan believed she was menaced by Russia and mobilized her strength and gained a notable victory. Germany's activity in the Orient before 1914, together with her aggressive policy in China, constituted a menace to Japan and was calculated to arouse her fears and lead her to adopt a military policy of some magnitude. A fair and honest consideration of the aggressive designs of France, Great Britain, Italy, Russia, and Germany with reference to China's territory will lead to the conclusion that Japan's position in the Orient was endangered, and justified her belief that her interests in Asia, potential or otherwise, were to be sacrificed to imperialistic policies by the strong nations of Europe. Japan's geographical position must be considered and her relations to China and other Asiatic territory must not be ignored. These conditions undoubtedly filled the Japanese with apprehension and inspired Japan to adopt a policy regarded as necessary for her preservation. But I do not believe that the Japanese people desire war with the United States or with any country.

Japan entered the League of Nations, and upon signing the treaty of Versailles submitted a statement which revealed her desire for peace and for an honorable station among the nations of the world. Her representative sits in the council of the League of Nations and she has consistently supported the policy of the league, which seeks world disarmament and the settlement of international controversies by peaceful means instead of the employment of military and naval

force. In my opinion, there is much exaggeration concerning Japan's naval program. Testimony before the committee was unsatisfactory concerning Japan's naval program. An admiral, speaking of the same, stated that she had "laid down only one battle cruiser up to the present time so far as we know." Her program," he stated, "involved the building of 12 light cruisers but 5 only are laid down and building." With reference to destroyers he stated:

"We do not exactly know how many are building, but we know that at least 10 are building now of the 47. She is building 10 submarines of the first line. Those are vessels of about 900 tons each. She is building 9 submarines of the second line."

The evidence before the committee also establishes what everyone knows to be the fact, that Japan is dependent upon other nations for steel and perhaps other materials needed in the construction of a naval fleet. Moreover, the resources of Japan are limited and she could not long continue any competitive naval program with the United States or Great Britain and other European nations. Japan can not contemplate an attack upon Mexico or any of the Latin American Republics. There is no quarrel between her and any nation to the south of us. Any attack by Japan upon Mexico or Central America, or any of the Republics in South America, would unite the Western Hemisphere, perhaps including the Dominion of Canada, against her. It would be supreme folly for Japan to even contemplate such a course. Nor is it conceivable that she would attempt to land troops upon our shores, or to send her fleet across the Pacific. If Great Britain's fleet would be powerless against our shores, and that is the testimony of competent naval experts, then it is preposterous to assume that Japan, 12,000 miles distant from our shores, could be more successful.

I refuse to join with the jingolists in our country who are determined to perpetuate the old order of things and who stubbornly resist a world-wide movement which, in my opinion, will prove irresistible for world disarmament and for a union of the peoples of the world in the interest of peace.

The proposition to make the American Navy the greatest in the world is a proposition to indulge in this extravagant luxury merely because our country is rich and powerful enough to do so. No support for this course can be found in our needs for naval defenses. The British Government has publicly stated that the United States, if it chooses, can have the biggest navy, and it is very much to be doubted if the English Admiralty will undertake to challenge or match the construction of capital ships for the consummation of the project, which has the Navy Department behind it, to give our Navy the first place in the world.

If it be claimed that our Navy must be the greatest in the world, in order to defend our commerce and defend our coasts, let me reply that this is precisely what was said by the Germans in their ambition to overmatch the British Navy. The fact was that the great German Navy was no more a necessity to defend the commerce of Germany than a great Dutch Navy was necessary to defend the commerce of Holland or a great Danish Navy to defend the commerce of Denmark. Danish ships, Dutch ships, Greek ships, and Belgian ships have as much freedom of commerce upon the seas as have the ships of the United Kingdom or of the United States. There is no warrant for the assertion that the protection of commerce requires great armaments. The nations which have a preponderance of naval power to-day will not use their naval superiority to interfere with the liberty of maritime commerce in time of peace. There is every assurance that the world may depend upon this and it is not necessary to defend every merchantman that piles the seas with the attendance of a ship of war.

The great naval powers of the world to-day offer no obstacle to the utmost freedom of trade and commerce upon the part of the smallest and weakest nation, and the liberties which the powers ask for themselves they have freely accorded and will freely accord to the ships of every nation. The day has come when the United States must cease its prodigal and useless outlays in time of peace, for the making of armaments and the construction and maintenance of great ships to be moved and maneuvered at an annual cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. Our naval policy must cease to be dominated by the professional naval view, and the influence of men who have a more comprehensive conception of the advantage and welfare of our country must become dominant in the naval policy of the Government.

The League of Nations offers a practical and feasible plan to secure world disarmament. The reactionary policy of the United States seems to be an impediment to the realization of the practical conceptions of the league. All members of the league earnestly desire to be relieved from military and naval burdens. If the United States should enter the league, the formulated plan of the league to secure disarmament would, in my opinion, be earnestly carried forward by all members of the league until its full fruition was realized. But, if this Nation does not enter the league, it should cooperate with its members for the purpose of achieving those beneficent purposes which inspired its conception. It can be readily understood what effect the action of the United States in refusing to ratify the Versailles treaty or to enter the League of Nations would have upon the rest of the world. Notwithstanding this Nation has no imperialistic ambitions or a desire to obtain territory belonging to other nations, its course and its present attitude undoubtedly have produced skepticism in the minds of some nations with respect to the sincerity of our declarations.

When the Secretary of the Navy and others declare that we must have the most powerful Navy in the world, and when demands are made to execute a program that will cost more than a billion and a half dollars, and entail upon the United States an annual expenditure of at least one-half billion dollars for its maintenance, other nations may not be criticized if they express some concern regarding our purposes. In my opinion, we can not reconcile our declarations that we desire peace and disarmament, with the avowal that we shall complete the 1916 program and supplement it with modern aircraft, submarines, etc., at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. If we believe in relieving the world from the burdens of military and naval disarmament, let us set the example.

The psychology of our action in carrying forward a militant naval program will be bad. It will tend to drive the world back into old paths—into policies based upon alliances and the balance of power, into the shadows and darkness from which we emerged when military autocracy in Europe was overthrown and when the right of determination was accorded to the peoples of the world. We should suspend the naval program to the extent herein indicated and either enter the League of Nations or address ourselves to obtaining an agreement with the great powers for the limitation of armaments and the establishment of tribunals for the settlement of international controversies.

The wealth and power of the United States, together with its isolated position, give us the primacy of the world. We should lead in every

movement for justice and righteousness and peace. This propaganda for a Navy to outstrip the world has little or nothing behind it excepting an appeal to the national pride and vanity. The adding of capital ship to capital ship is bound to raise misgivings on the part of other nations and will incline them to ascribe ulterior and imperialistic purposes to our Government and will engender distrust and jealousy against a people who in their hearts sincerely desire the welfare of humanity. If the United States desires, as it should, to have the emulation of other nations we should set them an example. Do we desire that they shall emulate us in the construction of men-of-war, or that they shall emulate us in our defense of the principles and purposes of international peace and justice?

Whether are we to lead the world? That is the question. Shall it be along the lines of arms and war, or upon the paths of peace and trade and constructive progress, which shall turn the work and materials of the world to the increase of goods and riches and wealth, for the blessing of all the nations? Do we desire to impress the world with fear and terror of our country or with that respect and trust and confidence which an adherence to the principles of liberty, of justice, and of peace will invite from all other nations? These questions are before us. Our answer will determine the fate of the world.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the other nations of the world are not likely, in my opinion, to reduce their armaments because they fear us. If they reduce their armaments it will be because they have faith in our good will and in our high purpose. I can not agree with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], and I feel called upon to register my dissent to the doctrine expressed by him.

That is the same identical doctrine that came out of Brandenburg. It is the same doctrine that penetrated and moved the people of Prussia in their management. It was the doctrine of the Hohenzollerns. It is the doctrine upon which this argument has largely proceeded, that we have got to make other nations afraid of us in order to induce them to lay aside their arms. If I am afraid of a man I will go armed myself, and the best way in which to induce other men to lay down their arms is to make them know that they are justified in their faith in our pacific and pure intentions.

The Senator from Utah referred this morning to a great doctrine laid down which struck me with much force. It was the doctrine of faith. The greatest Teacher that man has ever had in the world laid down the doctrine of faith, and on numerous occasions, in effect, said, "According to your faith, so be it unto you." We have forgotten what has occurred since 1914. There have some very great things occurred since 1914. Those who did not have any faith in their neighbors, those who believed in the power of the sword, those who were building up the power of Prussia and of the German Empire and of the Teutonic allies were directly responsible in 1899 at The Hague Convention and in 1907 at The Hague Convention for a refusal to modify the program of arming the nations of the world in rivalry against each other. The Teutonic allies at The Hague prevented the discussion of the question of disarmament. They were not willing to disarm. They wanted war, and they finally got war and the necessary consequences of war.

In 1916 we did adopt the so-called program of 1916, but that was two years after the world conflagration broke out. That was after the President of the United States realized, as he did realize in the spring of 1916, that the United States would soon be face to face, in all human probability, with the necessity for taking part in the war.

We had already been subjected to many indignities and injuries on the sea. We were already being advised that we were not permitted to go on our peaceful errands on the sea in accordance with international law. We were already menaced by the Teutonic powers, our lives defied and disregarded, not only by the Teutonic powers but by Great Britain as well. I will say, however, for Great Britain that at least her authorities always did respect American lives, and while property rights might have been invaded on certain occasions property rights can always be adjusted by international courts.

But in 1916 we were anticipating the necessity of war, and we laid down this program. In 1912, before the war began, our Navy cost approximately \$112,000,000 per annum, and now, two years having passed since the armistice, we are proposing through the House of Representatives to appropriate \$400,000,000.

Mr. KING. That is only for maintenance and for slight construction.

Mr. OWEN. For maintenance and a small part of construction. The Senate committee, with a lavish generosity that I do not appreciate at all, propose to add to that \$105,000,000 more, making the bill carry over \$500,000,000. That is over \$5 per capita—\$5 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is \$25 per annum on every family of five people in the country. When we consider the war expenditures, when we

add to that the bonus required for the soldiers, when we take into account our pensions, the amount goes up and up. When we remember that we have to pay the cost of the war, that we have to refund to the bondholders of the United States the moneys they have advanced with interest upon it, \$25,000,000,000; we must remember, too, that that is \$250 per capita, \$250 for each man, woman, and child in the United States, \$1,250 for each family, on account of the indebtedness of the war remaining as yet unpaid.

Do we not all know that these taxes at last come down upon the man who eats bread and meat and who wears clothes and must meet the necessity of housing? At last the taxes are paid by the consumers. Let us make no mistake about that. I wish to say that I believe the people of the United States are heartily tired of this question of unrestrained taxation.

One of the reasons why the disaster came last November to the Democratic Party was because in the haste and excitement of war our expenditures had reached so gigantic an amount, had rested so heavily upon the people; they were so disturbed and distressed in so many ways that they wanted a change. Democrats as well as Republicans wanted a change, and Democrats by hundreds of thousands voted for Harding for President of the United States because they, too, wanted a change. Let us make no mistake about that. This was not just a so-called purely Republican victory. It was a reaction in the country against the extravagance of war. It was a reaction in the country against the extravagance of taxation. It was a reaction in the country against the arbitrary conduct which always accompanies war and must accompany war. I do not blame the administration for many of the things which occurred along those lines, but when we consider the food and fuel control, the War Trade Board, the War Industries Board, the Council of National Defense, organized down to the crossroads; when we consider the innumerable ways in which the people were interfered with, it is no wonder they revolted. They wanted a change, and now I desire to say to my Republican brethren that if you do not give them a change with regard to these high taxes you will in the near future get what will justly come to you.

The program of 1916 was a program based upon the old conditions when every nation went armed to the teeth and had to go armed to the teeth, when Europe was an armed camp because of the Teutonic policy, the policy of force, the policy of brute power over other men. They made other men afraid of them and they reaped the consequences of making other men afraid of them. Other men are not as much afraid of them now, and the United States does not want to follow the Teutonic policy of making other nations afraid. There is no reason why Japan should be made afraid of the United States and there is no reason why the United States, of all nations in the world, should be afraid of that small nation on the Pacific who, compared with the United States, are poor and weak.

An argument was made here on the floor that we had reason to be afraid of the organization of China by Japan and of India by Japan, 300,000,000 in India, 300,000,000 of people who by their religious training are committed to the preservation of life at all hazards, three hundred millions of people who by virtue of their religion would not kill a bird. They do not destroy animal life, much less human life.

The idea of organizing the Chinese to make war on the United States is peculiarly preposterous. China for 2,000 years has been the most pacific of all nations. It is a great, peaceful, sleeping, democratic community. Each little community manages its own affairs. China, while she has had excited against the Japanese some hostility, has regarded the people of the United States with more favor than any other nation in the world. It was the United States that set the example of relinquishing the Boxer indemnity. The United States now is shipping millions of bushels of corn to China to feed the famishing people of China. It is a wise investment. It buys the good will of China. It establishes the confidence of China, and it is far better to spend \$15,000,000 in buying the love of the Chinese by feeding their famishing people at a small expense than to attempt to excite their fear of the United States at a huge expense in armament.

The only danger in the world might be found in the great Chinese people, 400,000,000 of people who do not fear death, being led from their pacific mode of thought into the idea of militarism. Chinese statesmen have warned the world against stirring up a military spirit in China, and the only way to stir up the military spirit in China is by making the Chinese afraid of the other nations of the world. Japan has made an error in that respect in my opinion which may lead to the great injury of Japan.

But, Mr. President, we established this program of 1916 at a time when there was visible nowhere a sound hope for the peace of the world by peaceful arrangement and by systematic disarmament of the great nations. Now, however, the Teutonic allies have no armies worth mentioning. France is only retaining her army because she awaits the reparation of the terrible injury done to France by the war through the Teutonic forces, and as soon as the pacific arrangement can be made for the reparations, France, and Italy as well, will have every justification and every reason to believe that they may reduce their own armies voluntarily to the lowest possible point.

They can not go on without bankruptcy. They know it and I think the Senate knows it. All the nations of the world, through the proposed League of Nations, have practically agreed to the principle of disarmament; and yet we hear Senators on the floor express their distrust of anything except brute force. We must "keep our powder dry"; we must build up our Navy greater than any other navy in the world; we must be prepared to conquer any other people on the sea. We have no need to dominate other people and there is no nation in the world that has any desire, in my opinion, to dominate the people of the United States.

The program of 1916 ought to be summarily abandoned. There is no sound sense in it. I denounce it. I regard it as little short of criminal to pursue a policy of building up military power in the United States and setting an evil example, when, of all the nations in the world, we have the opportunity to set a wise, a just, and a generous example to other nations. For us to sit here determined to carry out this gigantic policy of having the greatest Navy in the world operates as a threat and a menace both to Japan and to Great Britain.

I know there are people in the British Isles who believe that the United States is concerned to dominate the seas as against Great Britain. When we speak of Great Britain, when we speak of Japan, and when we speak of the other nations, I think that Senators ought to be careful to remember that we can not describe 100,000,000 people by one epithet. In Great Britain there are those who are strongly inclined to imperialism, but they have been compelled to recognize the great power of the majority of the English people who are not imperialistic; who are substantially democratic; who only want to live their own lives in their own peaceful way and who do not want to dominate other nations. I have honor for the British people. I respect them; I respect their ideals.

I think the same thing is measurably true of Japan. We ought to be peculiarly considerate of Japan, coming as Japan does into the body of nations comparatively recently. I think Japan has shown a reasonable attitude with regard to her relations with the United States. I have never been able to feel the slightest fear of Japan. The Japanese are industrious; they are skillful; they are economical. They have shown a wonderful degree of intelligence and they have shown a very decent respect for the United States. When recently an American naval officer was killed by a Japanese sentry, Japan took all kinds of pains to ascertain where the fault was and punished the higher officers, who at last were responsible for the action of the sentry, for not having properly instructed him. The Japanese did not fall upon the little man who had erred because of the instructions he had received. They went where they ought to have gone—to the man in control; they went to the man higher up, and they held him responsible. That is what they ought to have done. They set us a good example in that.

I think if we went to the men higher up and held them personally responsible for what they do we would do well. I think that is true with regard to the Senate. Senators on the floor of the Senate who are using terms with regard to foreign nations that will place us in a hostile and warlike attitude in the eyes of foreign nations, Senators who on the floor denounce Japan with bitterness, to have their utterances quoted by the jingo press of Japan from one end of the Japanese country to the other, are incurring a responsibility of the gravest nature. They ought to be held responsible by the sound opinion of this country when they are guilty of indiscreet utterances on this floor. If we desire peace, we have got to set the example of peace. Out in the western section of the country when 25 years ago every man wore a six-shooter, and every gentleman wore two, the consequence was men were shooting each other all the time for fear the other fellow would get the drop on them.

I think that before we spend this enormous amount of \$500,000,000 we might well hesitate; that we might well leave this bill for the Congress which is coming in within a few days. Mr. President, the American people gave a mandate to the new

Congress. I very much question the wisdom of the policy of the Congress which has been replaced by a new Congress, before the new Representatives, coming fresh from the people, can have an opportunity to express their will, taking the responsibility out of their hands, because under the forms of law it is possible to do so, and making an appropriation of \$500,000,000 on this account, when the new Congress might not be disposed to make the appropriation anything like so large, or, if they do, then, certainly, as they have a mandate from the people of the United States of the most recent date, they can act with more propriety than can this Congress. This matter may be determined by a number of votes of gentlemen who are not going to be Members of Congress two or three days hence.

Five hundred million dollars! Why should not this Congress wait a few days and allow the new Congress to pass upon this question? The bill will not go into effect until July following, and there will be April, May, and June—three months—in which the new Congress will have an opportunity to pass upon the question.

Mr. President, the junker argument is the argument of brute force. It is the argument that we must be stronger than our neighbor. It was the Prussian argument that they should arm themselves to the highest degree of excellence, and then, without notice, spring upon their unprepared neighbors. That is what Frederick II, the so-called Frederick the Great, did. When he came into power he illustrated the junker argument. The first thing he did was to write a wonderful book, which was anti-Machiavelian, in which he denounced the principles taught by Machiavelli; in which he denounced all underhand statesmanship, all camouflage; in which he proclaimed the Christian doctrines, and urged frankness and openness and gentleness and justice and righteousness in dealing with neighboring nations. Having established that reputation throughout Europe, he then, when he came into power, gave a series of balls, and, while the representatives of foreign nations were entertaining themselves to the strains of music and dancing, he suddenly threw himself, at night, at the head of an armed force of 50,000 men and rushed into Silesia and captured that country from Austria, with whom he had a treaty, and broke faith in that way by a sudden blow without notice. Is that the way to establish peace on earth? That is the policy of the Hohenzollerns; it is the policy of force; the policy of taking by force what you want from other people. I do not want to see the United States follow that evil and injurious and ultimately ruinous policy; and I do not believe it is necessary. I think the world is right now on the threshold of a world-wide perpetual peace, notwithstanding all of the evil prophecies I have heard from those who are talking about building up armaments and laying the foundation of their evil prophecies as the justification for that bad policy.

Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything with regard to these matters. I merely wanted to express my dissent from the idea that we were called upon of necessity to build up a gigantic force, when in point of fact it is our better policy to teach the doctrines of peace.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, all the funeral orations which have been pronounced since the obsequies over Abel have never put life into a corpse, and all the efforts to revive the League of Nations by oratory in the Senate will be equally futile. This is a government of the people. If the people have anything to say in the Government of the United States, then the League of Nations was condemned to death and executed on the second day of last November; and the Democratic Party came very near suffering the same fate at the same time.

From a party which had polled a popular majority of, I think, over a million votes only four years before, which had been in charge of the executive department of the Government during a great and successful war, we ended, or are in a few hours to end, our grip or control of the executive department at the mandate of more than 7,000,000 above a majority of the people.

Gentlemen may expend all of the time and energy they possess in seeking for other causes for this defeat, but he is blind indeed and deaf indeed who does not know that the Democratic ship went on the rocks because its captain was trying to steer us into the false harbor of internationalism.

What other great mistakes did the Democratic Party make? If there were mistakes made in the conduct of the war, they were mistakes made by our military or our naval chieftains, or they were mistakes made by that great body of civilians who came to the aid of the Government in its time of stress, and who came equally from both parties.

What great mistake did the Democratic Party make in handling the financial affairs of the country? There may have been blunders and errors, but for every law that was passed Republicans voted, and in the execution of those laws to a very large extent Republicans participated.

A calm survey of the field, a calm reading of the issues must convince every candid man that the great issue decided by the American people was whether we would abandon the ancient policies of this Government, policies so well laid down by George Washington in his immortal farewell address, or whether we should adhere to those policies. The American people answered in thundering tones. Yet we find men standing on the floor of the Senate to-day repeating upon this floor the speeches they made on the hustings when they were talking about the beauty of dreams and the glory of visions.

We had a eulogy on dreams here a few moments ago. Every time we use the illustration or speak of the futility of dreams, meaning to describe the impractical, we are immediately told that every great thing originated in a dream. I deny the proposition. Since the days of the prophets nothing has ever originated in a dream that has been of any good to anyone. Things originate in ideas, and there are mighty few men who have any lucid intervals when they are sound asleep. An idea is not a dream. It may be something new, but if it is of any value it is a sound thought and not an idle dream, not the vagary of a disordered intellect nor the drivel of a brain that is steeped in slumber.

I have been accused this afternoon of being practical. What is it to be practical? It is to pick one's course of conduct to suit the facts of life and not the dreams of life. It is to make one's ideas and one's plans so that they will work out. If they work out, they are practical. If they will not work out, they are impractical, and there is nothing in the world that is of the slightest value unless it will work out and bring direct results. If we could just get rid of the little oratorical vaporings and begin to talk with something of mathematical certainty, we would not have so much trouble to arrive at correct conclusions.

We hear a great deal of talk about idealism, the idealism of America, the idealism of men. There are two conceptions of idealism. If by idealism is meant that a man is so exalted in his purposes that he disregards his own interests from any selfish standpoint and endeavors to benefit other people without trying to benefit himself, that kind of idealism is admirable in an individual. But if by idealism is meant that a man follows visions and dreams, that he does things that are impractical, that will not work out, then that kind of idealism is closely associated with insanity.

It seems nowadays that if a man undertakes to talk about the facts as they are he is at once condemned as being utterly sordid. Unfortunately, after all the talk that we may have about ideals we must still face the old, cold, hard truths of life. We can not escape them. Although we stood and talked for a thousand years, still the hard facts would come and confront us. Legislation if it be wise recognizes the fact just as that fact exists, and having recognized it, it tries to better that fact if it be possible.

We have had some of these dreams in this country, much to our detriment and greatly to our loss. I heard a Senator deliver an address here the other day in which he denounced every preparation for war, every effort to place our country in the condition of defense. I heard the same Senator make the same speech in practically the same terms less than six months before the European war broke out.

There was then a band of people, calling themselves idealists, who went up and down the country telling us that there would never be any more war, that Christian civilization would not permit it; that the instruments of destruction were so terrible and the advance of Christianity and of humanitarian ideas so pronounced that there would never be any danger of any war. They announced, practically, that the millennium had come. They announced that in the face of some facts which the practical man observed all the time and for which he had regard all the time.

What were those facts? They were that Germany was increasing her armament; and she was not only increasing her armaments but she was doing it for a purpose. Great Britain was increasing her armament, and she was doing it for a purpose. France was increasing her armament, and she was doing it for a purpose. Fundamentally, that purpose was to outstrip the other nations of the world in a policy of imperialism. Coupled with that, of course, was something of fear which each of those nations may have had of the other. But the cold truth of history is that when England embarked upon her career of imperialism under Disraeli, when she started to seize the helpless lands and helpless people of the world, Germany and Italy and France followed her example, and it became a race, not between nations seeking to defend themselves but by nations seeking to exploit the earth. Every man who looked at the facts as they were knew that those conditions were liable at any time to produce a clash, and that clash finally came.

We were told there would be no war, notwithstanding those facts. Every man who said that there might be a war was condemned as a bloodthirsty villain. Accordingly, when the war broke out in Europe, every man who said that we might be dragged into that war and that there ought to be some preparation was denounced. The President of the United States declared that we were too proud to fight—and there was no preparation made. A Senator who spoke here this afternoon said that the President in the spring of 1916 knew we were going into the war. If that is true, then what right did the President have to conduct that campaign upon the slogan "He kept us out of war" and to stand upon the Democratic platform that declared we were going to stay out of the war?

We entered the war; and for what purpose? I have at great length and in previous addresses to the Senate read the record, and shown by the record two things: First, that we declined to enter the war, even when our ships were sunk, after the *Lusitania* had been sunk, after Belgium had been invaded, and when atrocity after atrocity had been committed which horrified the world. We finally entered the war because Germany had declared she proposed to renew her policy of sinking ships with submarines. Even then we did not declare war, but the President waited for an overt act to be committed. He declared, and declared officially, in substance that unless overt acts were committed we would not enter the war. Finally the overt acts were committed—three of our ships being sunk in one day—and we then entered the war. However, we did not even declare war on Germany. We declared that Germany had made war upon us and that a state of war existed.

There was not a word heard about democratizing the world; there was not a word heard about America going over there to settle the difficulties of Europe, and to stay over there to help settle them. We declared that Germany was making war upon us. Such a resolution would not have received in the Senate a single vote if there had been coupled with it a declaration that we were going to stay over there in Europe to help those nations settle their difficulties except the one in which we were concerned. Every man in this Senate who will be honest with himself will have to admit that.

The talk about democratizing the world began long after we entered the war; and, Mr. President, the talk about democratizing the world—and I say it with due respect—was about as senseless a thing as ever fell from human lips. I will tell you why. Who was it was to democratize the world? What were the instrumentalities by which the democratization was to be produced? There was one Republic in the war besides ours; all the rest of them were monarchies. The indefensible thought was put forward that six or seven kings, backed by six or seven aristocracies, were about to take the crowns off the heads of the monarchs of the world, including themselves, and turn the world into a great democracy. Who ever believed that would happen? Not a king lost his crown except by revolt of his own people, and some of those people have been setting up kings since. Some of the countries which we established are monarchies or near monarchies. Everybody that said that would happen was just a practical man, and that was all; he was not an idealist.

Then, we were told, pursuant to this same line of thought, that we would have a great brotherhood of nations assembled; and when those nations were assembled together, by their representatives, they would constitute a body devoted to the service of God and man, without a single selfish thought or a single iniquitous motive. What was the first thing that we observed? We observed that at the close of the war those countries that we had been told were to be the instrumentalities of the democratization of the world and the liberation of small nations seized every foot of territory that was held by helpless people anywhere in the world. England seized more territory, as the result of the World War, than Rome occupied in the prodest days of the Caesars; France seized bodies of land many times larger than her own domain; Italy took all that she could get within her grasp; Greece is engaged in a war at this moment for the purpose of expanding her dominions. We set up a new child, our first born; we baptized it from this holy fountain of internationalism and regenerated it with the new philosophy of humanity; we named it Poland; and the first thing it did was to march 300 miles into the territory of an adjoining State and, with fire and sword, begin the work of conquest.

We set up Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia, and they have been on the border line of war two or three times. One excuse for the French Army to-day was offered that it had to hold Syria. Why, and under what right? By the right of the sword; by the right of conquest.

So, Mr. President, in all the history of this world there is no more complete example of the fact that the nations of the Old

World have engaged in the policy of exploitation and expansion than is afforded by recent events; yet there were men who were charged with being merely practical and hard-hearted creatures who said that you can not take men who are engaged in that kind of spoliation and transform them into saints by having them meet over in Geneva and pass a resolution.

But I have only adverted to a little of this. What of Shantung? What of the plundering of that nation that had been our ally by the joint conspiracy and joint action of three of our other allies? What of the secret conniving and conspiring against China—a nation that we induced to enter the war? Yet we are told that the representatives of these nations, appearing in the league with their swords still dripping, would be the proper vicegerents of Christ on earth to establish His millennium among men!

But that is not all, sir. This league was formed for the purpose of crystallizing the fetters upon conquered people; of driving the nails into the coffin of the hopes of conquered masses upon penalty of being set upon, not by one nation but by the united powers of all the earth.

Mr. President, they have assembled themselves in their league, and it is discovered by practical men, which is only another way of saying sensible men, that when they sit around that table they are sitting each for the purpose of perpetuating its own power and its own greatness and of more firmly establishing itself and its possessions, whether taken justly or unjustly.

But, Mr. President, one of the things that the idealists expected was that this league would when organized reduce armaments. Let us not take our answer out of the clouds; let us take it out of the facts of earth. The fact is that when the peace council was assembled, even while the infant league was still awaiting its advent into the cradle, Great Britain declared that she would not surrender her sovereignty of the sea. Every responsible British statesman is on record to that effect; and if the British refused to surrender their dominance upon the sea, every nation of the earth knew that that meant they must stand to their defense, for they have sense enough to know that a nation so Roman in its spirit, so Roman in its traditions, so Roman in its policies that with but 38,000,000 people it could extend its dominions over 425,000,000 protesting human beings; that, with a little island home, it could extend its flag over one-third of God's habitable creation—that a nation of that kind did not keep a navy as a plaything. If they had any cause to doubt it, they had but to turn the pages of history and read the story, every page of which is written in blood and every line of which was penned with the sword; yes, and, as has been suggested by a Senator, every dollar of which was paid for by the conquered countries.

France, as has been stated here on the floor, absolutely declined to reduce her army, even though Germany had been disarmed and had been limited to 100,000 men for a constabulary. I do not criticize France for this; I am just telling these dreamers that they need not any longer wonder whether their dreams come true. Dreams of that kind do not come true. When you dream that there is going to be no more sun in the skies, that there are going to be no more stars at night, your dream does not come true; it is only when you dream of facts that your dream is ever realized.

Mr. President, if this League of Nations thing is what these gentlemen over here have been professing, even this afternoon while they stood tearfully beside its grave, why is it that it has not taken action to bring about disarmament? They proudly boast that they have in it now 46 nations, I believe, including Liberia. They tell us that they are so great and so powerful and so potential that we will ultimately be forced to join. If that is true, if they are so great an association as is claimed, why have they not acted, why have they not proclaimed disarmament?

Mr. President, let us look at it calmly. Let us try to use our common sense just a little bit. Let us assume that these 46 nations are assembled in good faith, that they propose in good faith to carry out a policy of disarmament, that they propose in good faith to unite their powers for the purpose of protecting each other in accordance with the written terms of the contract they have signed. Now, why do they not do it?

Germany is disarmed. Russia for the present is impotent. What is the menace, then, that keeps them from doing it? Is there any man born of woman who dares say it is the United States; that they believe that the United States of America has in its heart the remotest thought of making war upon any nation? The man who tells that story to himself is guilty of telling a falsehood to his own soul. He knows it is not true. There is not a man with common sense in the world who does not know that it is not true.

Do you think England is keeping her navy because she thinks we are going to attack her? Do you think France is keeping her army because she thinks we are going to attack her? Do you think Japan is keeping her navy because she thinks we are going 6,000 miles from our shores to pick a quarrel with her? They know that the sole purpose of the United States, declared by the vote of the people in the last election, is to stay home and attend to her own business and let all the rest of the world go home, and they have all certified, as the Senator from Connecticut suggests, time and again that we are the only nation they trust. They, therefore, are not keeping this armament because of anything that the United States is doing in the way of keeping out of the league. They have all of Europe and all of Asia and all of Africa for their field of operations. We have already told them to keep out of this continent, and we are going to make them keep out, too.

Why, then, do they not produce this peace? Why, then, do they not produce this concert of mind and heart? Why do they not agree among themselves to disarm? The answer is that there is not one of them that trusts the other; and there is not one of them that trusts the League of Nations, for the aggregate of 46 distrusts will not produce a confidence.

What is it that they want us in for? Why, they want us in for the same reason that they want us to cancel our debts to them. They want us to bear the expense. They want us in to guarantee that whenever they get a majority in the league that wants to do something the tremendous force of the United States will be there to help accomplish it. Now, what will that something be? Primarily, it will be that we will spend our blood and treasure to enable them to keep the greatest amount of loot that was ever gathered in a century of time since the world was created.

Mr. President, let me follow a dream a little bit. For some hours I listened to a sermon here this afternoon that sounded almost as good to me as though I had heard it delivered by a professional preacher in a great temple devoted to the service of idealism. The orator said, "Is the world never to be better? Are we not some time to reach a condition where we will no longer slaughter each other?"

Yes; maybe we will reach that condition some time, but what about the meantime? Maybe some day the golden glow will sweep over the night of ignorance and of selfishness; maybe some day the figure of the cross will be envisioned upon the skies; maybe some day the lion and the lamb will lie down together, and we will listen to the music of the anvil and the hammer beating swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks; but what about the interval of time? That is what is bothering me.

They tell us that our race is the best type of Christian civilization. Very well; I want to preserve that civilization until Christ does come to earth, and I do not want any individual to assume that he can transform himself into a second Christ by talking about idealism. Every once in a while, you know, there is a gentleman who imagines that he is Napoleon, or Caesar, or Hannibal, or Mahomet, or the Saviour. The trouble is, they are idealists; they are not practical men. Suppose we sit down here and say to ourselves, "Some day, somewhere, in some remote century of time, people are going to be so good that they will not kill us, and therefore we will throw away our weapons and give them several thousand years in which to butcher us"; and suppose that in the meantime this race of men to which we belong, and which is all that represents real civilization in the world, is destroyed. There will not be anybody to recognize the millennium when it does come. There will not be anybody with enough idealism to know what it is when he sees it.

If it be true that we are the custodians of civilization, then it is our duty to preserve that civilization. If it be true that America saved civilization less than three years ago with the help of France and England, or that they saved it with our help—I make no quarrel about the way you state it—how did they save it? They saved it with guns in their hands. They saved it with bayonets fixed. They saved it with mighty fleets that plowed the ocean. They saved it with metal, and they saved it with men who knew how to die, and perhaps they knew how to pray, too; but they fought as they prayed. So you have the problem now on the one hand of waiting for the millennium and taking a chance on being butchered in the meantime and your civilization destroyed, and on the other hand you have the problem of preserving that civilization.

Mr. President, I think we have the best civilization and the best Government over here. Anyway, it suits me better than anybody else's Government. I have not joined that merry crew of modern Tories who can stand on the floor of the Senate and

say that Great Britain has a better Government than the United States. She has not anything better than the United States except a navy, and that is better only because it is bigger, and I am not in favor of allowing her to retain that advantage any longer; but she is a great people. Next to ours, perhaps, except France, she has as good a Government as there is. We are not expecting war with England; we are not expecting war with anybody; but what is the part of wisdom? Is it not to be in shape so that other nations will not trespass on our rights and force us into war? And that brings me back to a thought that I had partially expressed earlier in my talk.

We started out by telling the people of the world that we were too proud to fight, and they took us at our word. We had but a small Navy; we had but a small Army; but, worse than that, the nations of the world that had real military experts understood that we had scarcely a factory that could turn out the instrumentalities of modern warfare unless we transformed that factory, and that took time; and so the Germans said, "We can clean up France and England," to use a slang phrase; "we can conquer them before America gets in; and, anyway, she is too proud to fight, and she will not come in."

It was the great mistake that Germany made. She found out that while we could talk peace with our mouths we could fight with our arms. She found out that the real heart of this people still pumped the good red blood of the Revolution. She found out that we could get ready quicker than she thought we could. She had miscalculated.

Senators, I will take my share of responsibility for not having advocated, in the past, a stronger Navy. If we had had a Navy as great as that of the British Empire, do you believe that Great Britain ever would have seized one of our ships in this war? Do you believe that Germany ever would have sunk an American ship? I have no more doubt in my mind that Germany would have carefully abstained from interfering with our commerce or firing upon our flag if we had had a strong Navy than I have of my existence.

But we did not have it, and she thought she could advantage herself by sinking vessels indiscriminately and we could not get into the war in time, and she would conquer France and England and Italy, and then she would have a separate question to settle with us.

Let us apply it now just as sensible men. Suppose a British ship were to commit some outrage upon our commerce to-morrow, or something we thought was an outrage. Suppose the vessel of some little South American country or North American country, let us say Mexico, were to commit a similar act against our commerce. Which of the two would we be most likely to send an ultimatum to? Every man who will be honest with himself on this question knows that we would be very careful, in dealing with Great Britain, to know that we were standing upon the absolute facts. We would be very diplomatic in our dealings with her. We would exhaust every resource of diplomacy before we would resort to force. You also know that in the case of Mexico if you did not have a strong President who stood up and demanded that we should not treat her differently from the way in which we would treat a great nation, if the outrage had been one which appealed to the imagination of our people, we would be at war with her in a very short time, or we would compel her to come to humiliating terms, at least to instant reparation.

What is true of these nations is true of us. Let us see about Japan. Let us see about the treatment we are receiving from this blessed League of Nations. The President reserved the island of Yap—at least he thought he had, and that it was to be internationalized. Everybody smiles at the name. It is not an important island, except as a station for wireless and cable work, telegraphic communication, but it is very important for that.

But Japan says she holds it under the mandate of the League of Nations, a mandate of this organization of a few men who meet over there once in a while; that they have told her to hold it. So she will disregard our rights in the Pacific Ocean, and she proposes to hold it. Do you know that I have this idea, that she would not say that to Great Britain, and the reason she would not say it to Great Britain is that British guns are too numerous and too long and the British fleet sweeps too many seas.

Suppose Japan persists in that? I am not going to say or intimate that it will produce war, but it will produce an ugly feeling, and there are conditions which might arise out of it which might be very serious. Let me just dismiss that line of argument. It is rather too delicate to pursue; but let Senators think about it.

Mr. President, advocates of the League of Nations and the good intentions of the League of Nations do not seem to have very much confidence in their child. There it is over there, with 46 nations, all anxious to keep the peace. If so, what have we to fear?

The truth about the matter is that you know it has already proven itself a disappointment. It has been said here that Japan is not building a navy. Mr. President, a partial quotation from some article the Senator gave is the first statement I ever heard to that effect. Upon the contrary, the papers and periodicals have borne telegram after telegram showing the great effort Japan is making to increase her navy. We are told with a singular sort of amusing phraseology, first, that England has stopped building capital battleships, therefore that she is leading us in the march of peace; but before the sentence was concluded it slipped out of the Senator's mouth that the reason she has quit, if she has quit, is that she has gone into conquering the air.

The fact is, and we all know it, and it is the only argument I have ever heard which seems to me to be worth anything against carrying out this naval program—the fact is that some great military experts claim that modern battle fleets will be helpless if they are attacked from the air by modern air fighters, and further say that Great Britain is so much convinced of that that she has actually stopped building some of her fleets, but when she stopped building the fleets to sail the surface of the seas she began building other and greater fleets to sail the air.

What does that prove? Does it prove the good intention of Great Britain to disarm, or does it prove her desire to create still more superior arms?

Yet that is the kind of argument we are treated to on the floor of the Senate hour after hour and day after day.

Mr. President, one could stand here and talk a long time in reply to these statements. I think I have said about all I want to say. My own notion is that we laid down a naval program in 1916 which ought to be completed, no matter what else is done. We have passed a resolution by a unanimous vote of the Senate asking the only two great naval powers there are outside the United States to meet with us and to agree upon a limitation of sea armament.

If we put that limitation on to-morrow, nobody will conceive the idea that they are ready, in the present state of the world, to reduce the British Navy and take her battleships off the ocean, or that Japan is going to sink her navy and we are going to sink ours. What may be accomplished, if it is gone at in a sensible way, is to secure an agreement that, present programs being carried out, there will be no more vessels built for a period of time. Then by future negotiations we may be able to do something regulating the future. But, sirs, even such a program as that ought to embrace the right of the United States to a better position upon the seas relatively than she has to-day.

Now, let me tell you why I say that. I do not believe, even after the lesson of this Great War, that we conceive fully the importance of the command of the seas. If we had a disagreement with France and with England and with other nations, nevertheless it is nothing but an agreement, and treaties have been broken ever since they have been written, and no nation is wise which relies alone upon treaty arrangements.

England to-day has command of the oceans, and let me just give you this one thought—not new perhaps to any of you, but it happens to fit in what I am saying just now. The command of the oceans was always important, but the command of the oceans to-day means the command practically of the world. Wars of a hundred years ago were fought by armies that marched over land; on horseback or on foot they traveled. They had to either live off the country or they had to haul their provisions behind them in immense wagon trains, slowly and laboriously, over muddy roads. The result was that armies were limited in their size.

The armies of Napoleon would have been insignificant in the late war. Their field of operations was limited. The length of the war was limited. Their devastation was similarly limited.

Now, Mr. President, railroads have annihilated distance upon the land; the most remote interiors are brought into immediate touch with the ocean's shore. The steam vessel has taken the place of the sail ship, and accordingly the country that commands the ocean commands the resources of the entire world, and can bring them all to bear at the point of mobilization. Men were making articles 1,000 miles south of the Equator and 2,000 miles north of the Equator, which in a few days, a few weeks at the outside, reached the line of contact between the French and English and the German forces in France.

The busy fingers of millions of women, thousands of miles away from the field of war, were knitting, making clothing here

because they loved some of the combatants or because they were paid for their labor. Of course, those in our country and in the countries actually at war did not do it for pay. Mills, factories, a million wheels were buzzing all over the world and a united industry and power, the creative strength of the world, was mobilized; and it was in the control of the nation that controlled the seas. If Germany could have kept the seas, Germany would have won the war. If Germany could have kept a fleet upon the seas so strong that England could not overcome it, even though it could not overcome the British fleet, we never would have been able, probably, to have landed a single squadron of soldiers in France. Every man knows how helpless is a fleet of transports, with no weapons, laden with its thousands of boys. If one single man of war comes within gunshot, all go to the bottom. So if Germany could have kept a few vessels upon the ocean, England never would have been able to have mobilized her troops from Australia and Canada, New Zealand and India. Her food and her men alike would have been gone, and we would not have been able to go to her assistance effectively.

Mr. President, that is an alarming situation. We need not in any way reflect upon Great Britain. We must treat her, however, as a great rival, a friendly rival to-day in the world. May she always be friendly. I am unwilling that my country shall be in a position so that her ports can be blockaded, her commerce destroyed, and all the energies and all the resources of the world brought to bear upon us. Especially am I of that view when I contemplate the fact that just north of us there is an immense domain under the flag of Great Britain, with 9,000,000 loyal British upon the soil of that vast domain, with islands that fringe the Atlantic and constitute a screen beyond our shores, nearly all of them under the British flag; that within 50 miles of Miami, Fla., England owns the land; that this double fringe of islands practically closes the Gulf of Mexico and commands the canal; that upon our Pacific coast we are equally open to attack; that our neighbor to the south is none too friendly, and is too helpless to protect her own domain if she should be attacked.

This is not jingoism. A jingo is a man who proposes to stir up his people to war and to war against others. This, sir, is an attempt to preserve the integrity and independence of the United States and to keep her at peace by certifying to all the world that we are prepared to defend ourselves.

Mr. President, that is all I desire to say upon this question. I think it is time to get down and face the cold facts of existence. If the resolution which was drawn by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], which was introduced by him, and I believe, finally, for some reason, was introduced in substantially the same form by another Senator, will bring Great Britain and Japan to a condition where they are willing to limit armament, then well and good. I voted for the resolution; I supported it; but in the meantime I am not willing to stop for one single day pending the negotiations. The harder we work now and the faster we build now, the quicker we will have a resolution of that kind brought to fruition and the better terms we will get.

We have had a great deal of talk about saving money. I will tell the Senate how we can save several million dollars a year. Let us abolish the Federal Trade Commission. We created it one day, and they said it would only cost us about \$25,000 a year. It costs \$900,000 a year now, and I think it is doing \$9,000,000 a year damage. Let us get rid of some of these useless bureaus.

There is another thing. We have a large debt abroad. I am going to stop to mention that. I think that debt is much more likely to be paid if they understand that the sheriff has a gun in his pocket than if one goes out with his hat in his hand asking to have it paid. I am not suggesting war to get it. I do not mean that. I think the time has come to deal with all these questions as practical men, to recognize facts exactly as they are, to get our heads out of the clouds and our eyes upon the earth where we live, and let us try to make them see that our country is secure, and if our country is secure civilization will be secure. If our country is ever unfortunately destroyed, then, in truth, will the flag of civilization have been furled.

I started to sit down, but I thought of something else I wanted to say, and I will say it while I am here. Our country has reached a point economically where it must manufacture vast quantities of goods and create vast quantities of provisions and supplies to sell all around the world. Fifty-one per cent of our people now live in cities.

The markets of the world are the only answer to continued prosperity. We have expended hundreds of millions of dollars in building ships to trade with the world. If we are to

trade with the world and do it through the merchant fleet that we own, there must necessarily be a policing of that business. We can not send our commerce into every country and land and send it there with safety unless the nations of the world understand that we are prepared to protect our rights. When they understand that, they will not interfere with us. If they understand the contrary they will.

Let us take a lesson out of the story of China. She has been following idealism. So far as I know it has been nearly a thousand years since China ever undertook a war that could be called a war of conquest.

She has taught the doctrine that men ought not to fight even in defense of their own homes; that war is brutality. She has taught it so successfully that her civilization has gone backward; that her lands are being divided up, and that the most virtuous nations in the world, even Great Britain and France, join with the ancient enemy of China to divide her asunder. That demonstrates how much confidence can be put in an agreement.

China had an agreement. She not only had an agreement, but she was then sending her sons to die on the fields of France, as we were sending ours, except she did not send them as soldiers, but sent the poor fellows with spades and picks in their hands to die without a chance to fight back. Having made that sacrifice, and even while she was making it, while Chinamen were breathing poison gas into their lungs, while their veins were being drained through the wounds made by the bullets of Germans, England and France sat down with Japan and robbed China. Then, Senators talk about relying upon agreements! Would they have done that to China if she had had an army? Would they have done it to China if she had had a fleet sailing the oceans and back of big guns yellow men who knew how to shoot? Some kinds of idealism approach idiocy.

Mr. President, I should not have taken this much time of the Senate at this hour, but I understand that it is a fact that the naval bill has no chance to go through at this session, and I might just as well talk as anybody else. I felt like saying these things. We have had this old corpse of the League of Nations dragged around the Senate Chamber for the last 30 days by a number of gentlemen who acted as pallbearers at its funeral and who ought to know that it is dead. I am getting tired of ghost dances. Let me tell the Democrats on this side, I challenge your motives not at all. I think you were suffering from shell shock; that is all; but in the name of common sense why do we want to cling to an issue that brought us to this frightful defeat? Why not accept it? Why not say the question was submitted to the people in a great and solemn referendum, and the people decided it and we are going to accept the decision and quit talking about it? Do you want to tie that corpse on your back and enter another race? If so, then let me tell you what will happen. You will lose every State in the South as well as every State in the North. I said on this floor that the solid South would be broken in the last election, and it was. I am not a prophet, but I am not an idealist. I might get low enough to run a bunko game, but I never would play it on myself; at least, I would not do so a second time.

I hope we are as wise at least as the old farmer who had just returned from the great city of New York. His friends, observing a package under his arm, securely wrapped up in paper, said to him, "Uncle Dan, where have you been?" He replied, "I have been to New York." They said, "Well, we hope you did not buy another gold brick?" He answered, "Well, yes; I did; but I told the fellow I bought it from that if it did not turn out better than the one I bought from him before I would not patronize him any more." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I hope that we are through with that issue. I thank the Senate.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 23, 104, and 105.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert the following: "\$77,839,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
HARRY S. NEW,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
LOUIS C. CHAMTON,
C. BASCOM SLEMP,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smoot in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what change, if any, was made in the amendment in regard to the distribution of automobiles and the trucks among the States for road building?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The conferees finally came to an agreement upon that item by which the Secretary of War is directed to sell or to dispose of by transfer to the Department of Agriculture, under the terms of existing law, an aggregate of 10,000 trucks now owned by the War Department, with the provision in effect that half of them shall be sold and half of them shall be transferred to the States through the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. OVERMAN. The distribution is to be on the 50-50 plan?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is to be on the 50-50 plan.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the best that could be done, I presume.

The War Department claims they need 50 per cent of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department did not make that claim, but the House conferees insisted that at least 50 per cent of them should be sold and the money turned back into the Treasury. That is the best compromise we could make upon the matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that the conferees on the part of the House insisted upon selling them all, but we were able to secure the compromise now provided in the bill, under which half of them are to be sold, and the other half to be transferred to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to ask the Senator from New York a question merely for information. Some days ago when this question was before the Senate, I think it was stated that there were some six or seven thousand trucks. The Senator from New York, as I understand, now states that there are 10,000 trucks to be disposed of. Is that correct?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from North Dakota has in mind tractors. The item under discussion relates to motor trucks.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator state the size of the Army that will be provided for under the proposed law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. President. The appropriation as now carried in the Army appropriation bill, in accordance with the conference report if agreed to, applicable to the pay of the enlisted men of the line and staff, which is the controlling item as to the size of the enlisted personnel, is \$77,839,300. That will pay for one year an Army of 165,000 men, including the Philippine Scouts and the flying cadets. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the House passed on the conference report?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The House has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But it is a final report?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a final report, being a complete agreement.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand this is the best that could be done concerning the amendment to which I have referred, be-

cause the House insisted on selling the trucks and this was a compromise on the 50-50 plan?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senate conferees, I pledge the Senator from North Carolina, did their best to stand by the Senate's position, but we did not feel justified in killing the bill upon a question of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CARE OF SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the opposition to the naval appropriation bill and, of course, the proper effort, in my opinion, on the part of the Senator in charge of that bill and of the Senate to pass it puts into grave peril two amendments to the sundry civil appropriation bill that should at this time have some consideration.

There is not a Senator on this floor who is more anxious to pass the naval appropriation bill than am I, and I do not for that reason purpose consuming valuable time at this juncture, but I want to remind Senators that amendments numbered 21 and 22 in the sundry civil appropriation bill are vital, I will say, to the honor of this Republic and to the well-being of its ex-soldiers; they are amendments that run to the very good faith of this Government, designed as they are to provide hospital facilities for the care and treatment of sick and disabled soldiers.

Now, I wish to inquire, respectfully, of course, where is the sundry civil appropriation bill, and is it going to pass or fail?

I am sure no one Senator here more than any other is interested in the hospital amendments in the bill, and if the sundry civil appropriation bill is to fail I know that each Senator here hopes and desires to have an opportunity to pass some other bill in which the hospital provisions of the sundry civil bill may be incorporated, so that money may be appropriated to enlarge the capacity of existing hospitals and erect such new hospitals as the Treasury Department and the Surgeon General may see fit. It seems to me that we ought not to permit the time to flow on without having some understanding as to what is to be the fate of the hospital amendments in the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. ASHURST. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator opened his remarks, but I will say that the sundry civil bill is still in limbo. The papers are in possession of the conferees on the part of the House, and they have taken them to the other side while we await action.

As to the items for the aid of the disabled ex-soldiers in connection with War Risk Insurance Bureau, vocational education, and hospital care, the sundry civil bill carries items amounting in all to \$267,600,400, \$18,600,000 of this amount is in one section of the bill to be immediately available and remain available until expended.

Mr. ASHURST. They are embraced in amendments numbered 21 and 22.

Mr. WARREN. I do not recall at the moment the exact numbers of the amendments, but they are in a section of the bill together, and the conferees of the House and the Senate have arrived at an agreement, so far as those particular items are concerned. They have broadened the scope somewhat as to the uses to which the appropriation may be applied, so as to secure immediate action. I believe the provision has been bettered, because in the first amendment it was rather necessary, as we used material which came over from the House from another committee which authorized certain action to be taken, but did not appropriate funds for it.

There is a perfect agreement upon that item, and I believe that before we adjourn there will be a perfect agreement in the House and Senate, and the hospitals will be provided for.

I will say to the Senator from Arizona that he is no more anxious about the matter; in fact, I think he can hardly possibly be as anxious as I am concerning it.

Mr. ASHURST. If I may interrupt the Senator, let me say that I premised my remarks by asserting that we are all—I said one Senator no more than another—equally anxious about those amendments. Do I understand the Senator, who is chairman of the committee, to say that there may be an agreement?

Mr. WARREN. Not on the sundry civil bill as a whole perhaps.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, if the conferees are not to agree upon the sundry civil bill, of course, amendments numbered 21 and 22 will perish, because they are part and parcel of the bill, and

we are not, under our rules, of course, permitted to carve out one or two of the amendments and agree to them and have them become a law if the bill is to fail. Does it not, therefore, seem to be the part of wisdom that a separate bill should be introduced embodying these two amendments as the conferees have agreed on them, and that such a bill should be passed? Should not some measure be taken now before this day expires so that it will be impossible for any Senator, if through some odd mischance he should attempt to do so, to kill the hospital bill? Would it not be the part of prudence now to take measures so that beyond the shadow of a doubt the hospital provisions on which the conferees have agreed may in some way become a law?

Mr. WARREN. That is the intention of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ASHURST. I have absolute faith in the statement of the chairman of the committee, and if he assures me that the committee intends to and will take care of the hospital items, I am content.

Mr. WARREN. They intend to provide for at least that amount of money and to make it immediately available, and that it shall remain available until expended.

Mr. ASHURST. That relieves me immensely, Mr. President. Now, the learned Senator says the conferees intend to do it. Will he not give us, because he has it in his power, the assurance that they will do it? The Senator can do that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to finish my statement?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. What is troubling me most and what I want to endeavor to get is not only the \$18,600,000, but I want to get the whole \$267,000,000 for this purpose agreed to and have it provided by the present Congress, if possible.

Mr. ASHURST. And I honor the Senator for his attempt to do so. I am not casting any strictures upon him; but if the sundry civil bill is to fail it will be impossible to secure the enactment of the provisions embraced in the amendments referred to, whereas I believe there would not be a dissenting voice on a roll call; in fact, I believe we could have a unanimous vote on amendments numbered 21 and 22, as modified by the conferees.

Mr. WARREN. I shall call on the Senator later to assist me in coming to some understanding as to this entire problem, embracing the whole sundry civil bill, and particularly the amendments that he has mentioned.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was just going to say to the Senator from Arizona that I do not think there will be very much prospect of carrying out the program that he outlines. We are just as capable here of using as much time when the Senator undertakes to bring that matter up as he is of using time when we are trying to pass the naval appropriation bill, and we will be very much disposed to do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, as the question of the sundry civil bill has come up, I want to say just one word. I do not believe in foreshadowing coming events and I am not going to take up the time of the Senate to-night.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Washington. Will the Senator pardon me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator from Arizona had yielded the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. I did not understand what the Senator from Washington stated in regard to the hospital amendments. I did not catch the full force of his statement. Will the Senator from Washington advise me as to what he said?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood that the Senator was talking about this matter in disagreement in the sundry civil bill, the matter of the establishment of a nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals Rapids.

Mr. ASHURST. I am talking about the matter of hospitalization.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is that in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. ASHURST. That is in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is there not a disagreement between the two Houses on the Muscle Shoals nitrate plant?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know anything about that. That is what I was trying to inquire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is in the same bill.

Mr. ASHURST. It is. All I wish to be assured of—and I think we all agree to that—is that whether the sundry civil bill is imperiled or not we ought to pass the hospitalization item; and I want the Senator from Washington to know that I am as earnestly in favor of the naval appropriation bill as he is, and want to help him in my weak way if I can; and I

hope he will not consider that because I rose to take a few minutes of time in asking about the hospitalization item I am any the less interested in the naval appropriation bill. I am profoundly interested in it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I appreciate that. I understand the Senator's attitude. I was speaking altogether about the disagreement on the sundry civil bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Now I yield the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I did not intend to bring up this matter at this late hour, and I would let it go without discussion now except for the fact that some reference has been made to the sundry civil bill and seeming to couple its failure with some action on this side of the Congress.

The action of the Senate has been uniformly proper. The Senate conferees have acted only within their rights. The action on the other side of the Capitol can not be justified in any legislative body. I do not intend to foreshadow this discussion until to-morrow, when we will know what has happened, and then the responsibility will lie at the door of the men who carry the responsibility. For any man or set of men, because they want by strong-arm methods to defeat one item, to destroy an appropriation bill that carries \$267,000,000 for the wounded and disabled soldiers of this country is to commit a crime against the Nation and the American people.

This question will be understood; but I do not propose to raise the issue. I did not bring it here now. There are yet hours in which this mistake may be remedied. When the time comes, the country shall know where the responsibility rests.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhues, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed with an amendment the bill (S. 4332) to exchange the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for a new site and building.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 4664. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 20 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, as amended by the act of Congress approved April 20, 1920;

S. 4864. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914;

S. 4893. An act to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union; and

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize payment to members of the Army and Navy who were employed as enumerators during the Fourteenth Decennial Census to take the census of persons in the Army and Navy.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 346) extending the time for payment of purchase money on homestead entries in the former Standing Rock Indian Reservation in the States of North and South Dakota.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. STEDMAN as a member of the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, on the part of the House, in place of Mr. RUCKER, resigned.

ENROLLED BILL.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CHAMP CLARK.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon, including an invitation to the Vice President, the Vice President elect, the Members of the Senate, and the Members of the Senate elect to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative in the Hall of the House of Representatives, to be held on Saturday, March 5, 1921, at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a very painful duty to perform.

For nearly a half century the public has had the services of one of the most remarkable men who have rendered the scroll of American statesmanship illustrious. At the age of 22 his talent was so recognized that he was made president of one of the important colleges of the country. By his own exertions he fought his way to the front and became distinguished at the bar of his State. He served with rare distinction and merit in the

legislative bodies of his State. He came to the American Congress, where his great abilities and sterling patriotism won for him the respect of the House of Representatives, and for at least 25 years he has been a great national figure and national leader.

He was engaged in all the fierce struggles of these years, yet as he sleeps to-night there is not an enemy in all the world for CHAMP CLARK.

His integrity was never challenged, his manhood never attacked, his courage never questioned. As rugged as the granite hills of his native State, as tender as the blossoms that glorify the fields of his adopted State, as strong as the oak, and as sweet as the babe he lived, and, like a good soldier, without fear, without drawing back, he wrapped the mantle of his manhood about him and laid him down to the embraces of that final repose which all must some time enter into.

So it is my very painful duty to announce to the Senate that at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes to-day CHAMP CLARK, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, died.

Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of the House be appointed to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. CLARK in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes antemeridian, on Saturday, March 5, instant, and that the Members of the present House and of the House elect attend the same.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, the remains of Mr. CLARK be removed from Washington to Bowling Green, Mo., in charge of the Sergeant at Arms, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these proceedings to the Senate and invite the Vice President, the Vice President elect, the Members of the Senate, and the Members of the Senate elect to attend the funeral in the Hall of the House of Representatives; and that the Senate be invited to appoint a committee to act with the committee of the House.

Resolved, That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the President elect, and the members designate of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the Chief of Naval Operations, and the General of the Army to attend the funeral in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 472) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 14 Senators be appointed by the Presiding officer, to join the committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to take order for the superintending of the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Senate accept the invitation of the House of Representatives extended to the Vice President, the Vice President elect, the Senate and the Members of the Senate elect, to attend the funeral of the deceased, to be held in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 10.30 o'clock a. m., on Saturday next, March 5, instant.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate to take order in superintending the funeral of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, late a Representative from the State of Missouri, Senators REED, SPENCER, ROBINSON, SUTHERLAND, SHIELDS, KENYON, OWEN, LENROOT, RANSDELL, FERNALD, ASHURST, HARRISON, BECKHAM, and McKELLAR.

Mr. REED. As a further mark of respect, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, March 3, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 24), 1921.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Daniel Whilldin Hand.

INFANTRY.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Orval P. Townshend.

To be major.

William Montrose Inglis.

To be captain.

John Halpin Burns.

To be first lieutenants.

Luis Felipe Cianchini.

Victor Emanuel Domenech.

To be second lieutenants.

Timothy Sapia Bosch.

Juan Luis Oliver.

Eduardo Andino.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be second lieutenant.

Corwin Lynn Rogers.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS.

To be Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs.

Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be first lieutenant.

Robert Benjamin Hood.

INFANTRY.

To be first lieutenants.

Fernand George Dumont.

Herbert Benjamin Wilcox.

Prince Edgerton Tripp.

CAVALRY.

To be first lieutenant.

Raymond Thomas Connell.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be major.

Jacob Arthur Mack.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be captain.

Charles August Bader.

To be first lieutenant.

Earl Raymond Adlington.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

James Walter Bunce.

Fletcher Olin McFarland.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Consuelo Andrew Secane.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

To be colonels.

William Allen Phillips.

Ervin Louis Phillips.

Samuel Dickerson Rockenbach.

Robert Cutts Williams.

Walter Cowen Short.

George Columbus Barnhardt.

James Haynes Reeves.

Kirby Walker.

Claude Bernard Swezey.

Sterling Price Adams.

Julian Robert Lindsey.

Julius Theodore Conrad.

Howard Russell Hickok.

Marcus Butler Stokes.

Samuel McPherson Rutherford.

John Henry Parker.

John Edwin Woodward.

George McDougall Weeks.

Isaac Erwin.

Samuel Vinton Ham.

Robert Walter Mearns.

Henry Lee Kinnison.

Guy George Palmer.

Orrin Rawson Wolfe.

Joseph Edward Cusack.

Meriwether Lewis Walker.

Robert Rossiter Raymond.

Samuel John Bayard Schindler.

William Renwick Smedberg, jr.

Howard Louis Laubach.

John M. Morgan.

Andrew Erwin Williams.
 Walter Crosby Babcock.
 Herbert Ball Crosby.
 Benjamin Bremner Hyer.
 Mathew Charles Smith.
 Kenzie Wallace Walker.
 Howard Rand Perry.
 Lincoln Fay Kilbourne.
 William Brooke.
 George Hairston Jamerson.
 Hunter Bithal Nelson.
 Odus Creamer Horney.
 Frank Ellis Bamford.
 Fredrik Lorensten Knudsen.
 William Baker Ladue.
 William Jones Barden.
 Edward Phillip O'Hern.
 Charles William Castle.
 Francis LeJan Parker.
 George French Hamilton.
 Paul Bernard Malone.
 John White Craig.
 John Fisher Preston.
 Hugh Douglas Berkeley.
 Albert Eugene Saxton.
 Hamilton Smith Hawkins.
 Charles Frederic Crain.
 Frank Sherwood Cocheu.
 Ora Elmer Hunt.
 Frank Parker.
 John Campbell McArthur.
 Frank David Ely.
 Edwin Bell.
 Otho Bane Rosenbaum.
 George Henson Estes.
 George Vidmer.
 Oliver Edwards.
 William Ernest Welsh.
 Frederick G. Stritzinger, jr.
 Charles Curtis Smith.
 Frank Livells Wells.
 Briant Harris Wells.
 Pegram Whitworth.
 Frank James Morrow.
 Robert Sanford Offley.
 Edward Hugh Schulz.
 Harry Burgess.
 Casper Hauzer Conrad, jr.
 Charles Herman Paine.
 Thales Lucius Ames.
 Nathan K. Averill.
 Harry LaTourette Cavenaugh.
 Mortimer Osborne Bigelow.
 August Carl Nissen.
 Thomas Walter Darrah.
 Americus Mitchell.
 Perry Lester Miles.
 James Ackerman Lynch.
 Milton Loomis McGrew.
 Clyde Emile Hawkins.
 Lorrain Thompson Richardson.
 James Southard Parker.
 Charles Roscoe Howland.
 Louis Meredith Nuttman.
 Glenn Hedges Davis.
 Joseph Southerland Herron.
 Thomas Francis Dwyer.
 Benjamin Taylor Simmons.
 Girard Sturtevant.
 Louis Hermann Bash.
 Frank Bingly Watson.
 Oscar Jerome Charles.
 Thomas Absalom Pearce.
 Robert Henry Allen.
 Dwight Warren Ryther.
 Alvord Van Patten Anderson.
 Edward Theodore Hartmann.
 Frederick Benjamin Shaw.
 William Burr Cochran.
 Harry Frederick Rethers.
 George Matthias Hoffman.
 LeRoy Eltinge.
 John Buffalo Christian.
 George Williams Moses.
 Charles Ezra Stodter.

Alexander Macomb Miller.
 Charles Bryant Drake.
 Harry Ormiston Williard.
 Herschel Tupes.
 John Parsons Wade.
 Isaac Newell.
 Lawrence Burton Simonds.
 Ola Walter Bell.
 Abraham Grant Lott.
 Merch Bradt Stewart.
 Frederick Worthington Lewis.
 Edward Leonard King.
 Dennis Edward Nolan.
 James Newell Pickering.
 Reynolds Johnston Burt.
 Samuel Field Dallam.
 William Kelly, jr.
 Russell Creamer Langdon.
 Harry Herbert Tebbetts.
 Henry Charles Whitehead.
 George Swazey Goodale.
 William Dixon Chitty.
 Frank Crandall Bolles.
 Alfred Eldrekin Kennington.
 Edward Percy Orton.
 Alexander Thompson Ovenshine.
 Henry Edgar Eames.
 Paul Giddings.
 George Lawrence Byroade.
 Edward Seymour Walton.
 Alfred Theodore Smith.
 Fred Leigh Munson.
 Thomas McArthur Anderson, jr.
 William Durward Connor.
 John Calvin Oakes.
 Sherwood Alfred Cheney.
 Frederick William Altstaetter.
 Harley Bascom Ferguson.
 Charles Du Val Roberts.
 Robert Swebston Abernethy.
 Francis Horton Pope.
 George Edward Mitchell.
 Pierce Ambrose Murphy.
 Mervyn Chandos Buckey.
 Frederick Theodore Arnold.
 Frederick Edgar Johnston.
 Claude Hamilton Miller.
 James Noble Munro.
 Harold Benjamin Fiske.
 Earle D'Arcy Pearce.
 William Stanley Valentine.
 Arthur Stewart Conklin.
 Henry Carpenter Smither.
 Roy Beveridge Harper.
 John Hendricken Hughes.
 Thomas Arnett Roberts.
 Edgar Alexander Sirmyer.
 Frank Ross McCoy.
 George Willis Helms.
 Rufus Estes Longan.
 William Mason Fassett.
 Halstead Dorey.
 Chalmers Gaither Hall.
 Clarence Richmond Day.
 George Franklin Baltzell.
 Willard Herman McCornack.
 James Francis Brady.
 Edgar Thomas Conley.
 Roderick Leland Carmichael.
 Andrew Moses.
 Edgar Thomas Collins.
 Preston Brown.
 Thomas Quinn Ashburn.
 Sam Frank Bottoms.
 Charles Higbee Bridges.
 Harold Edward Cloke.
 Samuel Curtis Vestal.
 Robert McCleave.
 James Villard Heidt.
 Charles Sherman Lincoln.
 Patrick Henry Mullay.
 Philip Raymond Ward.
 Frank Cranstoun Boggs.
 Clarke Stull Smith.
 William Preston Wooten.

Lytle Brown.
 Earl Ivan Brown.
 Amos Alfred Fries.
 Monroe Crawford Kerth.
 George Adolphus Nugent.
 Curtis William Otwell.
 William Edward Cole.
 Marcellus Garner Splinks.
 Lambert Whitfield Jordan, jr.
 Jacob Calvin Johnson.
 James Bartholomew Gowen.
 Harvey Wolfarth Miller.
 Edwin Dyson Bricker.
 Daniel Greenwood Berry.
 Malin Craig.
 Ralph Elliot Ingram.
 Robert Courtney Davis.
 Joseph Frank Janda.
 Ira Clinton Welborn.
 Alexander Elliot Williams.
 Charles Wesley Exton.
 Guy Vernor Henry.
 Conrad Stanton Babcock.
 Chauncey Benton Humphrey.
 Berkeley Enochs.
 G. Maury Crallé.
 Joseph Franklin Gohn.
 James Heyward Bradford, jr.
 Wallace Bryan Scales.
 David Lamme Stone.
 Ewing E. Booth.
 Alfred William Bjornstad.
 Amos William Kimball.
 William Edward Horton.
 B. Frank Cheatham.
 George Guilford Bailey.
 Carl Frederick Hartmann.
 Basil Overby Lenoir.
 William Mitchell.
 Robert Edward Wyllie.
 Patrick Aloysius Connolly.
 Malcolm Young.
 John Jacob Boniface.
 Laurence Clay Brown.
 John Bernard Schoeffel.
 Walter Trotter Bates.
 Englebert Glover Ovenshine.
 Harry Lee Steele.
 Benjamin Patten Nicklin.
 John William French.
 Cromwell Stacey.
 William Annesley Cavanaugh.
 George Madden Grimes.
 Thomas Raine Harker.
 Frank Dickenson Wickham.
 Bryan Conrad.
 William Keith Naylor.
 William Harrison Oury.
 Austin Freeman Prescott.
 Edgar Allen Fry.
 Rush Spencer Wells.
 James Brady Mitchell.
 Herbert Jay Brees.
 Harry Anthony Eaton.
 George Hoffman Penrose.
 Alfred Sully Morgan.
 Charles Henry Hilton.
 William Fayssoux Stewart, jr.
 Campbell King.
 Joseph Benjamin Douglas.
 Hudson Taylor Patten.
 Tenney Ross.
 Edward Kimmel.
 John Robert Procter.
 Frederick William Phisterer.
 Robert Hall Campbell Kelton.
 Percy Poe Bishop.
 Robert Osborn Van Horn.
 Ezekiel James Williams.
 Moor Neilson Falls.
 Henry James Hatch.
 William Frederick Hase.
 William Richard Doores.
 Alfred Andrews Starbird.
 John Robert Rigby Hannay.

James Frederick Howell.
 James Malcolm Graham.
 Joseph Lee Gilbreth.
 John Carroll Goodfellow.
 Charles Frederic Humphrey, jr.
 Willey Howell.
 George Jean Holden.
 John Thomas Geary.
 Charles Francis Bates.
 Charles Carrol Todd.
 John James Toffey, jr.
 Carl Anson Martin.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Joseph Lee Gilbreth.
 John Carroll Goodfellow.
 Charles Frederic Humphrey, jr.
 George Jean Holden.
 John Thomas Geary.
 Charles Francis Bates.
 Charles Carrol Todd.
 John James Toffey, jr.
 Carl Anson Martin.
 Mark Wheeler.
 George Daniels Arrowsmith.
 Edward Carpenter.
 Ivers Whitman Leonard.
 Pearl Michael Shaffer.
 Laurence Albert Curtis.
 Robert Robins Wallach.
 William Henry Jordan, jr.
 George Williams.
 Irving Joseph Carr.
 Easton Rutledge Gibson.
 Henry Churchill Bonnycastle.
 Edward Croft.
 Adolphe Hart Huguet.
 Raymond Shelden.
 James Davis Taylor.
 Frank Halstead.
 Harry Edward Knight.
 Woodson Hocker.
 Archie Jesse Harris.
 Alexander James Macnab.
 Henry Macpherson Merriam.
 Hanson Briscoe Black.
 Charles Sidney Haight.
 William Dennison Forsyth.
 Fitzhugh Lee.
 Ralph Brewster Parrott.
 Harry Parker Wilbur.
 Stanley Hamer Ford.
 Robert Mauro Brambila.
 Elijah Bishop Martindale, jr.
 John Nicholas Straat.
 Earle White Tanner.
 Henry Slocum Wagner.
 Frederick Guy Knabenshue.
 Thomas Jefferson Powers.
 Martin Lalor Crummins.
 James Monroe Love, jr.
 Paul Hester McCook.
 Frederick William Coleman.
 Frederick Singleton Lewis Price.
 George Bahnsen Pond.
 Dana True Merrill.
 Theodore Anderson Baldwin, jr.
 Arthur Latham Conger.
 James Brown Kemper.
 John Winthrop Barnes.
 George Elmer Thorne.
 Alfred Aloe.
 Frank Wheaton Rowell.
 Hugh Aloysius Drum.
 James Bradner Allison.
 John Lesesue De Witt.
 Clifton Comly Kinney.
 James Fuller McKinley.
 LeVert Coleman.
 Frank Carson Jewell.
 Patrick William Guiney.
 Charles Brooks Clark.
 Herman Walter Schull.
 Leon Benjamin Kromer.
 Charles Annesley Romeyn.

Henry Benjamin Clark.
 George Sherwin Simonds.
 Francis Neal Cooke.
 Stanley Dunbar Embick.
 Evan Harris Humphrey.
 Robert Halford Peck.
 Halsey Edward Yates.
 Clement Augustus Trott.
 Stuart Heintzelman.
 Laurence Halstead.
 Frederick William Van Dyne.
 John Dudley Long.
 Warren Dean.
 Grayson Villard Heidt.
 James Cooper Rhea.
 James Hanson.
 Fred Radford Brown.
 William Topping Merry.
 Lawrence Du Val Cabell.
 Clyffard Game.
 George Washington Stuart.
 William Taylor Patten.
 Duncan Kennedy Major, jr.
 James Justice.
 Llewellyn William Oliver.
 Reginald Edwards McNally.
 Ephraim Geoffrey Peyton.
 William Lewis Reed.
 Albert N. McClure.
 Ben Holloday Dorcy.
 Edwin Albert Hickman.
 Charles Louis McKain.
 Andrew Jackson Dougherty.
 Oliver Stevens Eskridge.
 Joel Robert Lee.
 George Evans Stewart.
 Alden Cook Knowles.
 Henry Aloysius Hanigan.
 Hjalmer Erickson.
 James Wadsworth Furlow.
 John Womack Wright.
 Frederick Rudolph De Funiak, jr.
 Ralph McCoy.
 Grosvenor Lowrey Townsend.
 Thomas Leverett Brewer.
 James Kelly Parsons.
 George Edward Ball.
 Reuben Smith.
 Clarence Browning Smith.
 Russell Potter Reeder.
 Howard Campbell Price.
 Walter Bogardus McCaskey.
 Oliver Hart Dockery, jr.
 John Robert Thomas, jr.
 Milton Artells Elliott, jr.
 Robert Franklin McMillan.
 George Doane Freeman, jr.
 William Elmer Hunt.
 Ernest Eddy Haskell.
 Warren Webster Whitside.
 Jack Hayes.
 William Henry Waldron.
 Godwin Ordway.
 Joseph Kepner Partello.
 Leon La Grange Roach.
 Frederick Curtis Johnson.
 Horace Potts Hobbs.
 Louis Joseph Van Schaick.
 Guy Cushman.
 Edgar Albert Myer.
 James Dean Tilford.
 Arthur Morson Shipp.
 Joseph William Beacham, jr.
 Guy Stevens Norvell.
 Robert Hayes Wescott.
 Paul Hurst.
 Allen Parker.
 Allen Smith, jr.
 Frank Burson Hawkins.
 Paul Tropler Hayne, jr.
 Fred Erskine Buchan.
 Edward Albert Sturges.
 William Luke Lubr.
 Hu Blakemore Myers.
 Henry Russell Richmond.

John Joseph Ryan.
 Charles Evans Kilbourne.
 Osmun Latrobe, jr.
 George Arthur Hadsdell.
 Wait Chatterton Johnson.
 James Millard Little.
 John Lawrence Bond.
 Joseph Samuel Cecil.
 Edward Raymond Stone.
 Albert Raymond Dillingham.
 William Richie Gibson.
 Will H. Point.
 Henry McCauley Bankhead.
 William Murray Connell.
 Theodore Burnett Taylor.
 James Longstreet.
 Henry Ashley Ripley.
 William Harrison Monroe.
 William Albert Kent.
 Theodore Schultz.
 Alvan Cullom Gillem.
 William Benton Cowin.
 Richard Ten Broeck Ellis.
 Frederick William Stopford.
 Henry Holden Sheen.
 John Wiley Gulick.
 Ernest Rollin Tilton.
 Homer Blackie Grant.
 Alexander Greig, jr.
 James Alfred Ruggles.
 Harry William Newton.
 Allen Dwight Raymond.
 James Robert Pourie.
 John William Cruikshank Abbott.
 Harry Thomas Matthews.
 Harry Cooper Barnes.
 Louis Stewart Chappelle, r.
 Granville Sevier.
 Robert Frame Woods.
 Albert Clifton Thompson.
 Ellison Lindsay Gilmer.
 John McBride, jr.
 Richard Kerr Cravens.
 George Oremaudle Hubbard.
 James Menzo Wheeler.
 Harrison Summers Kerrick.
 Walter Campbell Sweeney.
 Philip Sheridan Golderman.
 Charles Lewis Lanham.
 Joseph Sanders Hardin.
 Roger Stanley Fitch.
 Samuel Wheelan Noyes.
 Charles Warren Weeks.
 James Thornton Watson.
 William Wallace McCammon.
 Willis Prague Coleman.
 Albert Brown Sloan.
 Lucius Cincinnatus Bennett.
 John Ernest Morris.
 Lawrence Parker Butler.
 Paul Corbin Galleher.
 Claude Sharp Fries.
 William Greenough Doane.
 James Mobley Kimbrough, jr.
 Alvin Kelley Baskette.
 James George Hannah.
 Samuel Breck McIntyre.
 Milosh Radosablavitz Hilgard.
 Linwood Ellsworth Hanson.
 Charles Bertody Stone, jr.
 Frank Harold Burton.
 George Hubert White.
 Harris Pendleton, jr.
 William Gingrick Fleischhauer.
 Howard Gilman Davids.
 Ernest Van Dyke Murphy.
 Hilden Olin.
 Frederick Goederke.
 Albert Watson Alden Foreman.
 William Sanford Mapes.
 Samuel Aldrich Price.
 Perrin Lindsey Smith.
 Harry Lawrence Cooper.
 William Stanley Sinclair.
 Leslie Arthur Isaac Chapman.

Charles Louis Willard.
 Robert Henry Sillman.
 Arthur Pitt Watts.
 Thaddeus Brem Seigle.
 William Arthur Carleton.
 Lochlin Washington Caffey.
 William Saunders Faulkner.
 Ernest H. Agnew.
 Robert Oakes Ragsdale.
 Austin Allen Parker.
 Fred Van Schaick Chamberlain.
 Aubrey Lippincott.
 Robert Christian Humber.
 George Luther Hicks.
 John Henry Page, jr.
 Parker Hitt.
 Paul Ward Beck.
 John Morris Field.
 Edwin Joseph Griffith.
 Lynn Sawyer Edwards.
 Robert Irwin Rees.
 John Joseph Miller.
 Hugh Kirkpatrick Taylor.
 Jesse Marling Cullison.
 William Henry Noble.
 Wilbur Anderson McDaniel.
 Douglas McCaskey.
 Evert Roscoe Wilson.
 Samuel Burnette Pearson.
 Freeborn Page Holcomb.
 Clenard McLaughlin.
 Edward Beall Mitchell.
 James Henry Como.
 Harol Dever Coburn.
 Allen James Greer.
 Robert Whitfield.
 Frank Scott Long.
 John Porterfield Spurr.
 Samuel Grant Shartle.
 Michael Henry Barry.
 James Mifflin Loud.
 John De Camp Hall.
 Davis Catlin Anderson.
 Douglas Potts.
 Stephen Ogden Fuqua.
 Daniel Van Voorhis.
 Vincent Martin Elmore.
 Benjamin Robert Wade.
 Julien Edmond Gaujot.
 Delphey Truman Ellsworth Casteel.
 George Edwards Goodrich.
 Joseph Robert McAndrews.
 Edwin Simpson Hartshorn.
 George Edward Lovell.
 William Preston Screws.
 Ralph Brown Lister.
 Frank Luther Case.
 Harry Edward Comstock.
 William Russell Standiford.
 John Hugh Lewis.
 Frederick Sion Young.
 Thomas Samuel Moorman.
 Harry Newton Cootes.
 Charles Haskell Morrow.
 Lorenzo Dow Gasser.
 Brady Green Ruttencutter.
 Jennings Benjamin Wilson.
 William Oury Smith.
 Clarence King La Motte.
 George Michael Holley.
 Charles Ward Van Way.
 Wilson Gillham Heaton.
 Edgar Simon Stayer.
 Charles Henry Errington.
 George Clymer Shaw.
 Charles Ernest Reese.
 Edward Davis.
 Robert Soutter Knox.
 William Applegate Castle.
 Harry Dexter Blasland.
 Dorsey Cullen.
 Charles Coane Allen.
 William Jones Kendrick.
 Edward Harry Andres.
 George Thomas Bowman.

Thomas James Rogers.
 John Sherman Fair.
 Robert Joseph Reaney.
 George Washington England.
 Sherrard Coleman.
 Edwin Joseph Nowlen.
 Alvin Coe Voris.
 William Franklin Herringshaw.
 George Ernest Kumpe.
 Milo Charles Corey.
 DeWitt Warren Chamberlin.
 Walter Henry Johnson.
 Robert Gedney Rutherford, jr.
 Robert Emmet Grinstead.
 Albert Sidney Williams.
 William Bassett Graham.
 Charles Johnston Nelson.
 Ernest Alexis Jeunet.
 Charles Hart Danforth.
 Gideon Hazen Williams.
 Fred William Bugbee.
 William Munson Geodale.
 Leonard Trabue Baker.
 Franklin Schoch Leisenring.
 Charles Frederick Andrews.
 Allan Lindsay Briggs.
 James Marshall Petty.
 John Brooke Shuman.
 Frederic George Kellond.
 Herbert L. Evans.
 Harry Davis Mitchell.
 Ode Calvin Nichols.
 Kirwin Taylor Smith.
 William Weston Bessell.
 Frank C. Burnett.
 Collin Hankins Ball.
 Albert Owen Seaman.
 Clifford Utley Leonori.
 Benjamin Helm Pope.
 Clarence Gifford Bunker.
 William Howard Tobin.
 Harry James Watson.
 William Henry Raymond.
 Jacob Ellsworth Wyke.
 Gouverneur Vernon Packer.
 Paul Stanley Bond.
 Joseph Augustus Baer.
 Charles Fletcher Martin.
 Willis Virlin Morris.
 Walter Schuyler Grant.
 Charles Oswick Zollars.
 Robert Bruce McBride.
 Jacob Meyer Coward.
 John Lovering Roberts.
 Frederick Leroy Buck.
 Jay Paul Hopkins.
 Archibald Henry Sunderland.
 Morton Claire Mumma.
 Frank Porter Amos.
 Herman Glade.
 Arthur Penrhyn Stanley Hyde.
 Clifford Carleton Carson.
 Julian Arnold Benjamin.
 Samuel Reid Gleaves.
 Frank Sayles Bowen.
 Lewis Sidney Morey.
 Verne La Salle Rockwell.
 George Thompson Perkins.
 George Blanchard Comly.
 Charles Godfrey Harvey.
 George Brydges Rodney.
 Alexander Higbee Davidson.
 Christian Albert Bach.
 David Harmony Biddle.
 William Fredric Holford Godson.
 George William Winterburn.
 Lewis Foerster.
 William Porter Moffet.
 Archibald Francis Commiskey.
 William Albert Cornell.
 James Etter Shelley.
 Ward Dabney.
 Edward Calvert.
 Paul Myron Goodrich.
 William Wisner Taylor, jr.

John Burke Murphy.
 Bruce Palmer.
 George Audley Herbst.
 Jairus Alphaeus Moore.
 James Edmond Fecét.
 Thomas Meredith Hunter.
 Elverton Elmer Fuller.
 William Summerfield Neely.
 Frank Howard Adams.
 George Chase Lewis.
 William Henry Patterson.
 Elliott Malloy Norton.
 Roscoe Hugh Hearn.
 Frank Barker Edwards.
 Philip Worthington Corbuser.
 Frederick Marion Jones.
 John Adam Wagner.
 Archie Miller.
 William Hugh Clopton, jr.
 Wilford Twyman.
 William Oscar Reed.
 Henry Gibbins.
 Charles Oscar Thomas, jr.
 Edmond Ross Tompkins.
 Arthur Poillon.
 George Augustus Purington.
 George Wesley Biegler.
 Francis Wiley Glover.
 Lawrence Scott Carson.
 Alexander Bacon Cox.
 Timothy Michael Coughlan.
 James Huston.
 Leonard Lyon Deltrick.
 Richard Billups Going.
 Hamilton Bowie.
 Ben Lear, jr.
 George Parker Tyner.
 Morris Melville Keck.
 Auswell Edmund Deitsch.
 Henry Joseph McKeeney.
 Oscar Alonzo McGee.
 Casper Willis Cole.
 Oliver Perry Morton Hazzard.
 Frank Thomas McNarney.
 Thomas MacAllister Knox.
 William Remsen Taylor.
 John Patrick Hasson.
 Gordon Johnston.
 William Allen Austin.
 Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser.
 Jens Erickson Stedje.
 John Ezra Hemphill.
 Otto William Rethorst.
 Robert Sterrett.
 Emory Scott West.
 Ralph Carter Caldwell.
 Eben Swift, jr.
 Albert Edgar Phillips.
 John Alden Degen.
 Alvin St. Clair Perkins.
 Robert McFarland Barton.
 Walter Janatt Scott.
 James Edward Abbott.
 Selwyn Dyson Smith.
 George Frederick Bailey.
 Clarence Curtis Culver.
 Frederick Goodwin Turner.
 Frank Burch Edwards.
 James Perrine Barney.
 William Columbus Gardenhire.
 Joseph Cornelius Kay.
 Benjamin Oliver Davis.
 Walter Chambers Jones.
 George Ross Greene.
 LaVergne L. Gregg.
 Gustave Adolphus Wieser.
 Bertram Page Johnson.
 Charles Ridgely White Morison.
 Walter Lawrence Reed.
 Ira Franklin Fravel.
 Ned Merrill Green.
 James Alfred Moss.
 Charles Frederick Leonard.
 Franklin Potter Jackson.
 Henry Clay Merriam.

Robert Wilbur Collins.
 William Albert Covington.
 John Mitchell Dunn.
 Raymond Westcott Briggs.
 Francis Wharton Griffin.
 Theodore Herman Koch.
 James Laurence Long.
 Ralph Molyneux Mitchell.
 Frederick Louis Dengler.
 Richard Howard Williams.
 Lewis Stoddard Ryan.
 Kenneth Clyde Masteller.
 Tilman Campbell.
 Daniel Frank Craig.
 Thomas Lilley Sherburne.
 Joseph Matson.
 Francis Hicks Lincoln.
 William Henry Wilson.
 Augustus Bennett Warfield.
 Edward Dennis Powers.
 Charles Edward Nason Howard.
 Howard Lee Landers.
 Claudius Milton Seaman.
 Hugh John Bedell McElgin.
 William Henry Burt.
 Frederick Bernard Hennessy.
 Arthur Leonard Fuller.
 Henry Rozer Casey.
 John Sherman Chambers.
 Laurin Leonard Lawson.
 Morris Ernest Locke.
 John William Kilbreth.
 James Regan.
 Gilbert McKee Allen.
 John Randolph.
 William Hume Clendenin.
 John Royden Kelly.
 Edward Raynsford Warner McCabe.
 William Gustin Ball.
 Walter Eugene Gunster.
 William Richard Kendrick.
 Horace Fennell Sykes.
 Oliver Prescott Robinson.
 Gerrit Van Schaick Quackenbush.
 Sydney Herbert Hopson.
 William Eugene Gillmore.
 William Ernest Persons.
 James Gibson Taylor.
 Henry Clay Miller Supplee.
 William Kern Moore.
 David Yulee Beckham.
 John Overton Steger.
 Alex McMillan Hall.
 Elliot Caziarc.
 Richard Wilde Walker.
 George Augustus Franklin Trumbo.
 Carl C. Jones.
 Alfred James Booth.
 Emery Tritle Smith.
 Sydney Smith.
 Joseph Asa Marmon.
 James Aloysius Higgins.
 James Augustus Thomas.
 John Christian Ohnstad.
 James Dala Watson.
 Rinaldo Roscoe Wood.
 Charles Davis Winn.
 Francis Herbert Lomax.
 James Totten.
 Wesley Wilson Knox Hamilton.
 Hugh Screven Brown.
 Sebring Clay Megill.
 Harry Graham.
 James Hartz Bryson.
 William Barlow Wallace.
 Edward Neele Johnston.
 Clarence Osborne Sherrill.
 Ernest Dichmann Peek.
 George Redfield Spalding.
 Elliott Johnstone Dent.
 William Goff Caples.
 William Provines Stokay.
 Henry Clay Jewett.
 Wildurr Willing.
 Benjamin Hugh Kerfoot.

Roger Owen Mason.
 William Stacy Browning.
 Francis William Clark.
 John Harry Neff.
 Joseph Fauntleroy Barnes.
 Walter Driscoll Smith.
 William Pierce Ennis.
 Harry Birdwhistell Jordan.
 John Taise Sayles.
 Frank Purdy Lahm.
 Willis Grandy Peace.
 Creed Fulton Cox.
 Robert McCandlass Beck, jr.
 Dennis Hadley Currie.
 Beverly Fielding Browne.
 George Moore Russell.
 Edward Marsh Shinkle.
 Lewis Brown, jr.
 Francis Connolly.
 Sylvester Bonnaffon, III.
 Rowland Beverly Ellis.

To be majors.

John Sherman Chambers.
 James Regan.
 Gilbert McKee Allen.
 John Randolph.
 William Hume Clendenin.
 Edward Raynsford Warner McCabe.
 William Gustin Ball.
 Walter Eugene Gunster.
 William Richard Kendrick.
 Horace Fennell Sykes.
 Oliver Prescott Robinson.
 Gerrit Van Shaick Quackenbush.
 Sydney Herbert Hopson.
 William Eugene Gillmore.
 William Ernest Persons.
 James Gibson Taylor.
 Henry Clay Miller Supplee.
 John Overton Steger.
 Alex McMillan Hall.
 Elliot Caziare.
 Richard Wilde Walker.
 George Augustus Franklin Trumbo.
 Carl C. Jones.
 Alfred James Booth.
 Sydney Smith.
 Joseph Asa Marmop.
 James Aloysius Higgins.
 James Augustus Thomas.
 John Christian Ohnstad.
 James Dala Watson.
 Rinaldo Roscoe Wood.
 Charles Davis Winn.
 Francis Herbert Lomax.
 James Totten.
 Wesley Wilson Knox Hamilton.
 Hugh Screven Brown.
 Sebring Clay Megill.
 Harry Graham.
 William Barlow Wallace.
 Benjamin Hugh Kerfoot.
 Francis William Clark.
 Harry Birdwhistell Jordan.
 John Taise Sayles.
 Frank Purdy Lahm.
 Willis Grandy Peace.
 Robert McCandlass Beck, jr.
 George Moore Russell.
 Edward Marsh Shinkle.
 Lewis Brown, jr.
 Alfred Allen Maybach.
 Jerome Gray Pillow.
 Ralph Noble Hayden.
 John Anderson Berry.
 Leonard William Prunty.
 Gordon Robinson.
 Edmund Kearsley Sterling.
 Kerr Tunis Riggs.
 Carl Henry Müller.
 Charles Burnett.
 Claude Ernest Brigham.
 William Tidball.
 George Hathaway Baird.
 William Manley Cooley.

William Nafew Haskell.
 James Prentice.
 Henry Adolphus Meyer, jr.
 Frank Keller.
 Guy Kent.
 Copley Enos.
 Shepard Lawrence Pike.
 George Aloysius Wiczorek.
 Marion Somerville Battle.
 Henry Gilmore Stahl.
 Roy Carrington Kirtland.
 Stanley Symmes Ross.
 Wallace McNamara.
 Frederick Mears.
 Alden Max Graham.
 Robert LeRoy Collins.
 Irvin Lee Hunsaker.
 Clifton Ranney Norton.
 Eugene Julius Ely.
 Charles Russell Mayo.
 Arthur James Lynch.
 Guy Eugene Bucker.
 Rawson Warren.
 John Henry Read, jr.
 Robert Gray Peck.
 Robert John Binford.
 John Augustus Brockman.
 Charles Conaway Burt.
 Sheldon Webb Anding.
 William Gaither Murchison.
 Joseph Howard Barnard.
 Rodman Butler.
 Howard Stanley Miller.
 Clarence Lininger.
 Edward Murray Offley.
 John Cocke.
 Elvin Henry Wagner.
 John Thomas Donnelly.
 William Henry Menges.
 Ronald Earle Fisher.
 Thomas Watson Brown.
 Otis Robert Cole.
 Charles Emery Hathaway.
 Joseph Victor Kuznik.
 Edward Raymond Coppock.
 Shelby Carl Leasure.
 Peter John Hennessey.
 Kenyon Ashe Joyce.
 Charles Frederick Herr.
 Francis Joseph Behr.
 Fred Hays Turner.
 Howard Carlyle Tatum.
 Arthur George Fisher.
 Walter Krueger.
 Asa Leon Singleton.
 Arthur LeRoy Bump.
 Willis Edward Mills.
 George Grunert.
 Harry Westervelt Gregg.
 William Rivers Pope.
 Staley Alfred Campbell.
 John Rowe Brewer.
 Olney Place.
 Leo Asa Dewey.
 John Pope McAdams.
 Thomas Hood Cunningham.
 John Robert Musgrave.
 Sidney Derby Maize.
 Richard Wetherill.
 Hartman Lewis Butler.
 John Bryson Barnes.
 Thomas Taylor Duke.
 Harry Arthur Wells.
 Ralph Middleton Parker.
 George Warren Harris.
 Edward Gregg McCleave.
 Pat M. Stevens.
 William Holt Peek.
 George Steele Gillis.
 John Hastings Howard.
 John Joshua Fulmer.
 Joseph Irving McMullen.
 Matt Combes Bristol.
 Kelton Lyon Pepper.
 Francis Cassius Endicott.

Horace Nathaniel Munro.
Thomas Pitcher Bernard.
Daniel D. Tompkins.
Clarence Anderson Dougherty.
Henry Hossfeld.
John Jay Mudgett.
Isaac Samuel Martin.
Channing Edmonds Delaplane.
Laurance Oldham Mathews.
George R. Somerville.
Seth William Cook.
Milton Garfield Holliday.
Robert Rogers Love.
Thorne Strayer.
Francis Buck Eastman.
Kneeland Sparrow Snow.
Robert Galther Caldwell.
Hugh Almer Parker.
Charles Wesley Tillotson.
Will Dunbar Wills.
William Conrad Stoll.
Ira Austin Smith.
James Edwin Ware.
James Eveleth Wilson.
William James Davis.
John Fleming Clapham.
William Arden Alfente.
Daniel Andrew Nolan.
Walter Herbert Neill.
Edmund Anthony Buchanan.
Benjamin Delahaut Foulis.
Roy Wilson Ashbrook.
Ralph Hill Leavitt.
Goodwin Compton.
Launcelot Marmaduke Purcell.
James Edmond McDonald.
Carl Frederick von dem Bussche.
Albert Louis Rhoades.
Sam Pruitt Herren.
Fay Warrington Brabson.
Royden Eugene Beebe.
Edward Appleton Keyes.
John Gano Winter.
William James O'Loughlin.
Herbert Edward Mann.
Orlando Gray Palmer.
Francis Augustus Ruggles.
Henry Tilghman Bull.
Girard Lindsley McEntee.
Charles Keller.
Howard Russell Smalley.
John Scott.
Smith Aaron Harris.
Noble James Wiley.
James Pryor Castleman.
George Catlett Marshall, jr.
Talbot Smith.
Frank Edwin Davis.
William Wallace Overton.
Samuel Turner Mackall.
Walter Campbell Short.
Austin Myron Pardee.
Frank Fanning Jewett.
William Frederick Christian Jepson.
Augustus Francis Dannemiller.
Alfred Asa Hickox.
Samuel Greaner Talbott.
John Ernest Green.
Jason Marion Walling.
William Elmer Murray.
Norris Stayton.
George Allen Taylor.
Ralph Emerson Herring.
Houston Bales Parrott.
Glen Fay Jenks.
Edmund Turner Weisel.
Clarence Beaumont Ross.
Richard Henry Jordan.
William Storrs Bowen.
James Brewster Taylor.
Brainerd Taylor.
Emmet Roland Harris.
Avery John Cooper.
Frank Geere.
George Leftwich Wertenbaker.

Walter Campbell Baker.
George Percy Hawes, jr.
Richard Irving McKenney.
John Victor Spring, jr.
Charles Albert Clark.
Frank Charles Wood.
Aristides Moreno.
William Lay Patterson.
Charles Edward Wheatley.
Crispulo Patajo.
William Paterson.
Earl Briscoe.
Charles Almon Hunt.
Gilbert Henry Stewart.
Wade Hampton Carpenter.
Adam Floy Casad.
John Epps Munroe.
John Cargill Pegram.
Harry Lumsden Hodges.
Edward Jay Moran.
Victor Sidney Foster.
Walter King Wilson.
John Preston Terrell.
Myron Sidney Crissy.
Oscar Foley.
Frederick Dudley Griffith, jr.
Albert Bowdre Dockery.
Henry Edmiston Mitchell.
Charles McHenry Eby.
William Henry Cowles.
Henry Meredith Nelly.
Frederick Frasier Black.
William Alexander McCain.
John Knowles Herr.
Joseph Fulton Taulbee.
James Marcellus Hobson, jr.
David Henry Bower.
Hiram Marshal Cooper.
Troup Miller.
Benjamin Franklin Miller.
William Waller Edwards.
John Alexander Barry.
William Whitelaw Gordon.
Frank Leslie Pyle.
Walter Osgood Boswell.
Harold Burgess Johnson.
Malcolm Peters Andruss.
Gulielmus Villard Heidt.
Albert Hecker Mueller.
Samuel James Sutherland.
Franc Lecocq.
Emory Sherwood Adams.
Ralph Willard Drury.
John Carlyle Fairfax.
Fred Charles Miller.
Walter Joseph Büttgenbach.
Allan Francis McLean.
Charles Leslie Mitchell.
Robert John West.
Herman Stahlschmidt Dilworth.
Odiorne Hawks Sampson.
Albert Hardman.
Frank Blair Kobes.
Norman Harry Davis.
Hans Oscar Olson.
Alfred Brandt.
Charles Augustine Thuis.
Claremont Aymar Donaldson.
Franklin Thomas Burt.
Townsend Whelen.
Samuel Sumner Bryant.
Charles Smith Hamilton.
John Speed Davis.
Oscar Kemp Tolley.
Joseph Fulton Ware.
Harry Lightfoot Jordan.
Dean Halford.
Ralph Willcox Kingman.
Donald Davie Hay.
George Watkins Ewell.
Claire Raymond Bennett.
Bowers Davis.
John McEwen Pruyn.
Henry Wyatt Fleet.
Charles Gates Sturtevant.

Francis Henry Burr.
 John Chowning Ashburn.
 Robert Truman Phinney.
 Charles Edward Terry Lull.
 Charles Haynes Mason.
 Nicholas William Campanole.
 John Gordon Macomb.
 Lewis Worthington Moseley.
 Walter Williamson Merrill.
 Reginald Heber Kelley.
 Claude Newman Feamster.
 Joseph Oswald Mauborgne.
 Joseph Michael Cummins.
 Thomas Cebern Musgrave.
 Converse Rising Lewis.
 Charles Telford.
 Levi Galloway Brown.
 Owen Glenn Collins.
 Frederic Harrison Smith.
 Olan Cecil Aleshire.
 Frederick Ernest Shnyder.
 George Arthur Lynch.
 George Wilbur Cocheu.
 Charles Herman Patterson.
 Lewis Turtle.
 Clifford Jones.
 Louis Cass Brinton, jr.
 Thomas Fraley Van Natta, jr.
 James Andrew Mars.
 Quinn Gray.
 Robert Morgan Lyon.
 John Carter Montgomery.
 Louis Robinson Dice.
 William Mechling Colvin.
 Francis Hamilton Farnum.
 Benjamin Edwards Grey.
 Elvid Hunt.
 Dorsey Read Rodney.
 Alexander Mortimer Milton.
 Francis Maurice Hinkle.
 Benjamin Franklin McClellan.
 Campbell Blacksheax Hodges.
 Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest.
 Max Bruce Garber.
 Corbit Strickland Hoffman.
 Stephen Wilson Winfree.
 George Francis Rozelle, jr.
 Arthur Emmett Ahrends.
 Charles Franklin Severson.
 Harry Surgisson Grier.
 Reuben Chapman Taylor.
 Charles Beatty Moore.
 Clark Lynn.
 Cornelius Stockmar Bendel.
 Ben Frazer Ristine.
 Albert Gilmor.
 Stuart Ainslee Howard.
 John Francis Franklin.
 Roland Wallace Boughton.
 John Southworth Upham.
 Irving Monroe Madison.
 Ellery Farmer.
 Everett Newton Bowman.
 Homer Neill Preston.
 Jesse Gaston.
 Edward Aloysius Brown.
 William Franklin Harrell.
 George Edgar Nelson.
 Jesse Duncan Elliott.
 Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton.
 Carroll Borden Hodges.
 Daniel Murray Cheston, jr.
 James Madison Churchill.
 Philip Haxall Bagby.
 Luther Rice James.
 Andrew Davis Chaffin.
 Frederick Wegener Boschen.
 Emil Engel.
 Louis Farrell.
 Charles Otto Schudt.
 Emmett Addis.
 Harry Lazelle King.
 William Franklin Robinson, jr.
 John James Burleigh.
 Arthur Gerald Hixon.
 Augustine Aloysius Hofmann.

James Blyth.
 Edwin Gunner.
 Resolve Potter Palmer.
 Edward Eugene McCammon.
 Philip Remington.
 Charles Henry Rich.
 Paul Calkins Potter.
 Albert Thurston Rich.
 David Perry Wood.
 Charles Bean Amory, jr.
 Walton Goodwin, jr.
 Philip Bradley Peyton.
 Karl Truesdell.
 Frederick Brahan Terrell.
 Mark Lorin Ireland.
 Charles Avery Dravo.
 Charles Russell Alley.
 James Garfield McIlroy.
 Vaughn Washington Cooper.
 Chauncey Lee Fenton.
 Lucian Barclay Moody.
 Paul Delmont Bunker.
 Donald Cowan McDonald.
 Fulton Quintus Cincinnatus Gardner.
 Robert Charlwood Richardson, jr.
 Robert Madison Campbell.
 Jay Leland Benedict.
 Philip Henry Worcester.
 Charles Thomas Smart.
 George Bowditch Hunter.
 Joseph Warren Stilwell.
 James Kerr Crain.
 Carr Wilson Waller.
 Richard James Herman.
 David McCandless McKell.
 Matthew Arthur Cross.
 Henning Ferdinand Colley.
 Edward Lorenzo Hooper.
 Albert Howell Barkley.
 Stanley Koch.
 Irving Joseph Phillipson.
 Edmund Bristol Gregory.
 Wilber Alexander Blain.
 Walter Singles.
 Stephen Clark Reynolds.
 William Vaulx Carter.
 Gordon Rives Catts.
 Henry Conger Pratt.
 Ursa Milner Diller.
 Rollo Fred Anderson.
 Edwin Butcher.
 Russell Vernon Venable.
 Arthur James Davis.
 Kinzie Bates Edmunds.
 Martin Christian Wise.
 Andrew Jackson White.
 Walter Scott Drysdale.
 Edward Ellis Farnsworth.
 Charles Andrew Meals.
 Matthew Henry Thomlinson.
 Joseph Alexander Atkins.
 Charles Fullington Thompson.
 Augustus Bissell Van Wormer.
 Thomas Leslie Crystal.
 James Joseph O'Hara.
 Albert Courtney Wimberly.
 Arthur Dryhurst Budd.
 Ralph Rigby Glass.
 Erle Martin Wilson.
 Merrill Ellicott Spalding.
 Joseph James Grace.
 Ray Weber Holderness.
 John Donald Burnett.
 Joseph Alexander McAndrew.
 Richard Rembert Pickering.
 Lowe Abeel McClure.
 James Scott Greene.
 Gerald Clark Brant.
 Clement Hale Wright.
 William Ross Scott.
 William Washington Harris, jr.
 Napoleon William Riley.
 Otto Ludwick Brunz.
 George Carson Lawrason.
 Robert Pattison Harbold.

James Barton Woolnough.
 Innis Palmer Swift.
 Arthur Harrison Wilson.
 Walter Scott Fulton.
 Sherburne Whipple.
 Harry Hawley.
 Thomas Norton Gimperling.
 Hugh Lawson Walthall.
 John Buchanan Richardson.
 Anton Caesar Cron.
 Jaime Nadal.
 Oscar Winslow Hoop.
 John Clark Moore.
 William Frederick Pearson.
 James Alexander Ulio.
 Frank Moorman.
 Harry Harrison Bissell.
 Charles Bernadou Elliott.
 John Bunyan Corbly.
 Joseph Lybrand Topham, jr.
 Charles Lewis Sampson.
 John Marshall True.
 Bruce Robinson Campbell.
 John Charles French.
 Benjamin Banatt McCroskey.
 John Walter Downer.
 James Hatch Van Horn.
 Albert Benjamin Kaempfer.
 Forrest Elmer Overholser.
 Charles Winder Mason.
 Loren Chester Grieves.
 Henry Carlos Rexach.
 Eduardo Iriarte.
 William Thomas Carpenter.
 Teofilo Marxuach.
 Clifton Monroe Spears.
 Benjamin Mart Bailey.
 Frank Huntington Phipps, jr.
 Thomas Duncan.
 William Perkins Currier.
 Ambrose Robert Emery.
 Edmund Clivious Waddill.
 Allen Samuel Fletcher.
 Thomas Marshall Spaulding.
 Rolland Webster Case.
 Norman Foster Ramsey.
 Benjamin Henderson Lorne Williams.
 LeRoy Bartlett.
 Robert Collins Eddy.
 George Dillman.
 DeWitt Clinton Tucker Grubbs.
 James Frederick Walker.
 Thomas West Hammond.
 Ellery Willis Niles.
 Calvin Pearl Titus.
 Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl.
 Adelno Gibson.
 John Lee Holcombe.
 Charles Lewis Scott.
 Lloyd Burns Magruder.
 Robert Henry Lewis.
 William Charles Miller.
 Sidney Howland Guthrie.
 Ralph Talbot, jr.
 William Nicholas Hensley, jr.
 Arthur Willis Lane.
 Henry Tacitus Burgin.
 Nathan Horowitz.
 Bernard Lentz.
 Clifford Lee Corbin.
 Berkeley Thorne Merchant.
 Frederick Coleman Test.
 Owen Stedman Albright.
 Fred Hendrickson Baird.
 Hugh Hunt Broadhurst.
 Clifford Cabell Early.
 Arthur William Holderness.
 George Frank Waugh.
 Louis Albert O'Donnell.
 Allan Rutherford.
 Joseph Ray Davis.
 Oscar Arden Russell.
 Avery Duane Cummings.
 Charles Smith Caffery.
 Louis Albert Kunzig.

John Pearson Bubb.
 Clarence Andrew Mitchell.
 John Roy Starkey.
 Joseph Edward Barzynski.
 Ralph Dwight Bates.
 Ben Waller Feild.
 Bloxham Ward.
 Paul Hedrick Clark.
 Thomas Hixon Lowe.
 Torrey Borden Maghee.
 William Whitehead West, jr.
 George Washington Maddox.
 Walter Eldridge Pridgen.
 James Wilson Hemphill Reisinger, jr.
 Rupert Algernon Dunford.
 Charles Carr Bankhead.
 Michael E. Sliney.
 Fred Damman.
 William Greene Carter.
 Henry Roland Smalley.
 Edward Joseph Cullen.
 Ira Longanecker.
 William Robert McCleary.
 Robert Blaine.
 Frederick Julius Ostermann.
 William James Connolly.
 Everett Darius Barlow, jr.
 Lawrence Edward Hohl.
 James Griffin Boswell.
 James Macdonald Lockett.
 Felix Emmanuelli.
 Pascual Lopez.
 Daniel Rodriguez.
 George Harry Wright.
 Richard Coke Burleson.
 Lloyd Patzlaff Horsfall.
 Charles Gearhart Mettler.
 Charles Bhaer Gatewood.
 Joseph Halley Pelot.
 Morgan Lewis Brett.
 Forrest Estey Williford.
 Earl McFarland.
 Joseph Andrew Green.
 Alexander Garland Pendleton.
 Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright.
 John Cleves Henderson.
 Charles Alexander Lewis.
 Adna Romanza Chaffee.
 Edward White Wildrick.
 Paul Revere Manchester.
 Alexander Garfield Gillespie.
 Dawson Olmstead.
 Byard Sneed.
 George Williamson DeArmond.
 John George Quekemeyer.
 Frank Maxwell Andrews.
 Oscar Westover.
 John Sedgwick Pratt.
 Joseph Choate King.
 Martyn Hall Shute.
 George Gordon Bartlett.
 Henry Black Clagett.
 Clyde Rush Abraham.
 Pierre Victor Kieffer.
 George Harris Paine.
 Donald Allister Robinson.
 Rene Edward deRussy Hoyle.
 Philip Mathews.
 Richard Herbert Jacob.
 Ralph Allen Jones.
 Horace Fletcher Spurgin.
 Hugo D. Selton.
 Max Akin Elser.
 George Rivers Byrd.
 William Torbert MacMillan.
 Eston Murray Barker.
 Jacob Earl Fickel.
 Jesse Wright Boyd.
 Ebenezer George Beuret.
 Bruce La Mar Burch.
 Rush Blodgett Lincoln.
 Edgar Mason Whiting.
 William Fletcher Sharp.
 Walter Francis Llewellyn Hartigan.
 Bruce Magruder.

George Herman Huddleson.
 Edward Goff Elliott.
 Guy Herbert Wyman.
 Verne Raymond Bell.
 Henry Welles Baird.
 Harry Hall Pritchett.
 Alexander Hamilton Jones.
 Edgar Lee Field.
 Jere Baxter.
 Charles Louis Stevenson.
 Frank Kirby Chapin.
 Lloyd Ralston Fredendall.
 Rowan Palmer Lemly.
 Frank Thorp, jr.
 Albert Ellicott Brown.
 John George Donovan.
 Guy L. Gearhart.
 Leroy Pierce Collins.
 Ballard Lyerly.
 George Albert Wildrick.
 Allen Kimberly.
 Thomas Aquilla Clark.
 Phillip Woodfin Booker.
 Thomas Lee Coles.
 John Boursiquat Rose.
 Charles Tillman Harris, jr.
 Maxwell Murray.
 William Edgar Shedd, jr.
 Royal Kemp Greene.
 Howard Kendall Loughry.
 Robert Price Glassburn.
 Harry Keneth Rutherford.
 Paul Jones Horton.
 Fred Taylor Cruse.
 James Preston Marley.
 Robert Arthur.
 John Patrick Keeler.
 Lucian Dent Booth.
 Henry Lee Watson.
 Murray Blight Rush.
 Waldo Charles Potter.
 Henry Henderson Pfeil.
 Thurman Harrison Bane.
 Clyde Leslie Eastman.
 Jesse Cyrus Drain.
 Alexander Wheeler Chilton.
 William Eric Morrison.
 Donald James MacLachlan.
 Charles Henry Rice.
 Melvin Guy Faris.
 Alexander William Maish.
 William Jackson McCaughey.
 Eugene Ross Householder.
 James Gilbert Taylor.
 Eugene Santschi, jr.
 William Addleman Ganoie.
 Elmer Franklin Rice.
 Augustine Warner Robins.
 William Ducachet Geary.
 Emil Pehr Pierson.
 Clark Porter Chandler.
 John Walton Lang.
 George Thomas Everett.
 Henry Harley Arnold.
 Walter Raymond Wheeler.
 George Frederick Ney Dalley.
 Richard Huntington Kimball.
 Abbott Boone.
 Barton Kyle Yount.
 Denham Bohart Crafton.
 William Lewis Moose, jr.
 Frederick Story Snyder.
 William Eliot Selbie.
 William Carroll Christy.
 Sloan Doak.
 John Logan Jenkins.
 Charles Henry White.
 Alvin Gustav Gutensohn.
 Stanley Livingston James.
 John Stephen Sullivan.
 Leland Wadsworth, jr.
 David Grover Cleveland Garrison.
 James Lawton Collins.
 Evans Elias Lewis.
 William Caldwell McChord.

William Rudieil Henry.
 James Howard Laubach.
 George Richard Harrison.
 Ralph Wayne Dusenbury.
 Thomas Charles Spencer.
 Robert Mercer Cheney.
 Fauntley Muse Miller.
 Ray Corson Hill.
 Thomas Mayne Reid Herron.
 Thomas Franklin McNeill.
 John Gavin Tyndall.
 Alfred Lawrence Pearson Sands.
 Charles Peaslee George.
 Charles William Harlow.
 John Delbert Reardan.
 Ernest Leonard Pell.
 William Henry Rucker.
 William Henry Shepherd.
 Marshall Guion Randol.
 Joseph Carmoreau Hatie.
 George Meredith Peek.
 William Pegram Wilson.
 Charles Laurance Williams.
 Alexander James Stuart.
 Chester Jennings Goodier.
 Robert Emory Vose.
 John Stuart Williams.
 John Nesmith Greely.
 George Ruhlén, jr.
 John Waring Simons, jr.
 John Edward Mort.
 Charles Pope Hollingsworth.
 Edward Graham Taylor.
 Webster Allyn Capron.
 Thomas Donaldson Sloan.
 Frederick Monroe Barrows.
 Alfred Henry Erck.
 Henry Wirt Thomas Eglín.
 Walter Scott Greacen.
 Cary Ingram Crockett.
 José Perez-Brown.
 Lawrence Wright McIntosh.
 James Henry Burns.
 Everett Strait Hughes.
 Thomas Jefferson Smith.
 Roger Sheffield Parrott.
 Oliver Andrews Dickinson.
 Richard Edgar Cummins.
 Telesphor George Gottschalk.
 Harvey Douglas Higley.
 James Wilbur Lyon.
 Harold Geiger.
 Rodney Hamilton Smith.
 Albert Lawrence Loustalot.
 Richard Donovan.
 Robert Clive Rodgers.
 Homer Havron Slaughter.
 Sanderford Jarman.
 Clair Warren Baird.
 Edward Willis Putney.
 Gilbert Marshall.
 Henry Clinton Kress Mühlenberg.
 Lewis Lindsay Pendleton.
 John Francis Curry.
 James Eugene Chaney.
 Thomas Alexander Terry.
 Edward Nicoll Woodbury.
 Philip Gordon.
 William Jay Eltzmaurice.
 Carl Cogswell Oakes.
 John Thomas Kennedy.
 Ray Longfellow Avery.
 Horace Meek Hickam.
 Owen Riggs Meredith.
 James Clifford Williams.
 Edward Alexander Stockton, jr.
 Homer McLaughlin Groninger.
 Robert Emmett O'Brien.
 James Hutchings Cunningham.
 Stewart Oscar Elting.
 Simon Bolivar Buckner, jr.
 John Kimball Brown.
 Charles Hartwell Bonesteel.
 Richard David Newman.
 Thomas Jefferson Johnson.

Allison Barnes Deans, jr.
 Robert Howe Fletcher, jr.
 William Henry Garrison, jr.
 Frederick Ambrose Barker.
 Agard Hyde Bailey.
 Sumner McBee Williams.
 Henry Wallace Hall.
 John Hutchison Hester.
 Franklin Langley Whitley.
 Alfred Harold Hobley.
 Elmer Cuthbert Desobry.
 Arthur Earl Wilbourn.
 Emile Victor Cutrer.
 Harry Bowers Crea.
 Robert Christie Cotton.
 George Barrett Glover, jr.
 Henry John Weeks.
 Roy Alison Hill.
 Enoch Barton Garey.
 Leonard H. Drennan.
 Charles Kilbourne Nulsen.
 Theodore Kendall Spencer.
 Ernest Grove Cullum.
 Edwin Martin Watson.
 William Walter Erwin.
 Charles Dudley Hartman.
 Edgar Simpson Miller.
 Thomas Clement Legeran.
 Albert Lee Sneed.
 Lester David Baker.
 Walter Reed Weaver.
 William Whinery Hicks.
 Eugene Bonfils Walker.
 Frederick Colwell Phelps.
 John Burges Johnson.
 Edmund Russell Andrews.
 Joseph Albert Rogers.
 Max Robert Walner.
 Karl Ferguson Baldwin.
 Charles Kleber Wing, jr.
 Charles Elting Coates.
 Frank Sperbeck.
 Andrew Joseph Conroy.
 Francis Eugene Brady.
 Edward Postell King, jr.
 Martin Conrad Shallenberger.
 Herbert Hamlin White.
 John Henry Pirie.
 Kenneth Sheild Perkins.
 Chauncey St. Claire McNeill.
 Eugene Reybold.
 Robert George Kirkwood.
 Harold Everett Marr.
 Hugo Ernest Pitz.
 William Baldrige Loughborough.
 Joseph Wright Rumbough.
 Thomas Clair Cook.
 Olin Harrington Longino.
 Peter Hill Ottosen.
 Edgar Hall Thompson.
 Samuel Harvey McLeary.
 Frank Keet Ross.
 Oral Eugene Clark.
 Allan Clay McBride.
 Joe Reese Brabson.
 Herman Kobbe.
 John Norton Reynolds.
 Louis David Pepin.
 Leonard Craig Sparks.
 Robert Coker.
 William Ferguson Hoey, jr.
 Rufus Foote Maddux.
 Lincoln Beaumont Chambers.
 John Hale Stutesman.
 John Alden Crane.
 John Ashley Warden.
 James Anthony Sarratt.
 Willis Craig Knight.
 Frank Melvin Kennedy.
 John Robert Ellis.
 John Thomas Harris.
 Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker.
 Marion Ogilvie French.
 Frederick Almyron Prince.
 John Mather.

Chester Raymond Snow.
 George William Carlyle Whiting.
 Robert Emmett Mason Goolrick.
 Marshall Magruder.
 Walter Putney Boatwright.
 John Piper Smith.
 Charles Winslow Elliott.
 George Richard Koehler.
 Oliver Seth Wood.
 Allen Mitchell Burdett.
 Wilbur Rogers.
 Edwin Kennedy Smith.
 Louis Roberts Dougherty.
 Samuel Roland Hopkins.
 Charles Dudley Daly.
 Albert Kenny Craven Palmer.
 John Caffery Walker, jr.
 Clarence Talmage Marsh.
 Frederick Warren Stewart.
 John Blackwell Maynard.
 Jacob Frank.
 Jacob Herman Rudolph.
 Elbe Allen Lathrop.
 Raymond Ceward Baird.
 Warren Reigle Bell.
 Arthur Griffith Campbell.
 Matthew Addison Palen.
 Joseph Taylor Clement.
 Frederick LeRoy Martin.
 John Oscar Lackey.
 Seth Lathrope Weld.
 Thomas Clinton Fain.
 Bert Elmer Nickerson.
 Harold Lincoln Gardiner.
 Robert Addison Gillmore.
 Hugh Straughn.
 Raymond St. James Bowman.
 Edwin Hurlburt Rackley.
 Edward Parfit.
 Clinton Thomas Alden.
 Eacott Berton Miller.
 Jenner Young Chisum.
 Robert Clifton Garrett.
 Harry Jackson Castles.
 Burton Ebenezer Bowen.
 Guy Brandon Lawrason.
 Laurence Tidd Walker.
 Otto Harry Schrader.
 Isaac Edwin Titus.
 Halstead Powell Councilman.
 Arthur Haldane Doig.
 Robert Elton Guthrie.
 William Robert Nichols.
 Paul Henry Herman.
 Oscar Czar Warner.
 Frank Sheldon Clark.
 Kelley Benjamin Lemmon.
 William Skinner Fulton.
 Thomas Ogden Humphreys.
 Donald MacQueen Ashbridge.
 Hollis LeRoy Muller.
 Eli Elmer Bennett.
 Charles Todd Richardson.
 Clarence Edward Partridge.
 Leo James Ahern.
 Donald Meredith Beere.
 Homer Ray Oldfield.
 Herman Erlenkotter.
 Claude B. Thummel.
 Norton Meade Beardslee.
 Harold Earl Miner.
 Norman Butler Briscoe.
 James Leo Dunsworth.
 Elbert Eli Farman, jr.
 Ronald DeVore Johnson.
 Thom Catron.
 Francis Greason Delano.
 Jacob Loucks Devers.
 Phillip Hayes.
 Franz August Doniat.
 Raphael Robert Nix.
 James Lawrence Walsh.
 Carl Adolph Baehr.
 George Smith Patton, jr.
 Henry Horace Malven, jr.

Edward Luke Kelly.
 James Garssche Ord.
 Thurston Hughes.
 Robert Stanley Donaldson.
 Wallace Copeland Philoon.
 Charles Bartell Meyer.
 Herbert LeRoy Taylor.
 James Rowland Hill.
 Frederick Arthur Mountford.
 Delos Carleton Emmons.
 Arnold Norman Krogstad.
 Eley Parker Denson.
 Thomas DeWitt Milling.
 Roy Howard Coles.
 Henry Dorsey Farnandis Munnikhuisen.
 Philip Stearns Gage.
 Robert Lawrence Eichelberger.
 Monte Jackson Hickok.
 Robert Charles Frederick Goetz.
 Archibald Toombs Colley.
 Edwin Forrest Harding.
 Theodore Mosher Chase.
 Carleton George Chapman.
 Arthur Rutledge Underwood.
 Robert Sears.
 Joseph Plassmeyer.
 Chester Paddock Mills.
 Lee Dunnington Davis.
 Edwin Russell Van Deusen.
 Frank Leroy Purdon.
 Merl Paul Schillerstrom.
 Carlin Curtis Stokely.
 Louis Philip Ford.
 John May McDowell.
 Clifford Bluemel.
 Wentworth Harris Moss.
 Manton Campbell Mitchell.
 William Hood Simpson.
 Walker Evans Hobson.
 William Charles Koenig.
 Harry Walter Stephenson.
 Lucien Helm Talliaferro.
 John Charles Fremont Tillson, jr.
 Vernon George Olsmith.
 Ralph Ernest Jones.
 Herbert Hamilton Acheson.
 Willis Shippam.
 Frank Dexter Applin.
 Rollin Larrabee Tilton.
 John Keel Jemison.
 Furman Edgar McCammon.
 Raymond Elliot Lee.
 Louis Blaine Bender.
 Augustus Norton.
 Thomas Jamerson Cecil.
 Ralph Chrystal Harrison.
 Francis Page Hardaway.
 Clement Craig Heth.
 Frederic Alton Price.
 Edward Prescott Noyes.
 Charles Elliott Ide.
 William David Frazer.
 George Fleming Moore.
 Roy Robert Lyon.
 Jason McVay Austin.
 George Lane Van Deusen.
 Leopoldo Mercader.
 Frank Asbury Turner.
 James Albert McGrath.
 Courtney Hicks Hodges.
 Rollo Curtin Ditto.
 James Henry Tierney.
 Frederick Martin Armstrong.
 Joseph Cumming Thomas.
 Isaac Joshua Nichol.
 John Adoniram Sterling.
 William Patrick Kelleher.
 William Henry Sullivan.
 Clarence McCain McMurray.
 Guy Ichabod Rowe.
 George Stevens Gay.
 John Magruder.
 Charles Martin Everitt.
 Per Ramee.
 Harrison Cressy Browne.

Charles Herbert Lantz.
 James Henry Reynolds, jr.
 Harley Cleveland Dagley.
 William Nichols Porter.
 George Howard Brett.
 Maurice Benjamin Willett.
 Robert Elmer Jones.
 Alexander Warner Cleary.
 George Marshall Parker, jr.
 Belton O'Neill Kennedy.
 Cary Robinson Wilson.
 John Herman Hood.
 Richard Stearns Dodson.
 Christopher Dudley Peirce.
 Philip Ljungstedt Milnor.
 Joseph Fredrick Cottrell.
 Edward Lathrop Dyer.
 Wallace Loring Clay.
 Walter Lucas Clark.
 Simon Willard Sperry.
 Daniel Nanny Swan, jr.
 Charles McHenry Steese.
 Harry Wylie Stovall.
 Fenelon Cannon.
 Richard Ferguson Cox.
 John Piersol McCaskey, jr.
 Edward Stuart Harrison.
 David McCoach, jr.
 Edgar Warren Taulbee.
 Dwight Knowlton Shurtleff.
 Francis Henry Miles, jr.
 Fred Clute Wallace.
 Burton Oliver Lewis.
 Herbert Raymond Odell.
 Reginald Biffeld Cocroft.
 Clyde Andrew Selleck.
 Kenneth Bailey Harmon.
 Ernest Joseph Dawley.
 Elmore Beach Gray.
 Herbert O'Leary.
 Louie Arnold Beard.
 Williard Karle Richards.
 Harry Dwight Chamberlin.
 James Irvin Muir.
 John Julius Waterman.
 Ivens Jones.
 Frank Drake.
 Meade Wildrick.
 Frederick Arthur Holmer.
 Daniel Huston Torrey.
 John Millikin.
 Fred Seydel.
 Durward Saunders Wilson.
 Parker Cromwell Kalloch, jr.
 Maurice Duncan Welty.
 Charles Albert Chapman.
 Joseph Eugene Carberry.
 Frank Floyd Scowden.
 Emmett Wilbur Smith.
 Herbert Edgar Marshburn.
 Charles Hines.
 Jack Whitehead Heard.
 William Armistead Pendleton.
 Walter Kilshaw Dunn.
 Charles Manor Haverkamp.
 Walter Hale Frank.
 Guy Woodman Chipman.
 Fred Barnes Carrithers.
 Frederick Elwood Uhl.
 Edgar Willis Burr.
 Harvey Henry Fletcher.
 John Erle Beller.
 John Frederick Landis.
 Joseph Stephens Leonard.
 John Arner Robenson.
 Joseph Page Aleshire.
 Walter Moore.
 Oscar Wolverton Griswold.
 Harding Polk.
 Robert Horace Dunlop.
 Allen Richland Edwards.
 Emil Fred Reinhardt.
 John Gray Thornell.
 William Augustus Beach.
 John Thomas Hazelrig O'Rear.

Ralph Edward Haines.
 Thomas Hardaway Jones.
 Laurence Watts.
 Henry Newbold Sumner.
 Edward Roth, jr.
 George Winship Easterday.
 Austin Garfield Frick.
 Sydney Smith Winslow.
 Wilmot Alfred Danielson.
 Francis Joseph Torney.
 Boltos Elder Brewer.
 Edgar Bergman Colladay.
 James Allan Stevens.
 Emmert Wohleben Savage.
 Frederick Ramon Garcin.
 Tolbert Frank Hardin.
 Douglas Campbell Cordiner.
 Julian Sommerville Hatcher.
 Benjamin Lafayette Carroll.
 Bernard Robertson Peyton.
 Whitmon Robert Conolly.
 Frank Anderson Sloan.
 Everett Collins.
 Russell Peter Hartle.
 Oswald Hurtt Saunders.
 Spencer Ball Akin.
 Robert Gibson Sherrard.
 John Wesley Hyatt.
 Ralph Waldo Wilson.
 Fred Mortimer Green.
 Delmar Samuel Lenzner.
 Roland Wilbur Pinger.
 Donald Armstrong.
 Franklin Babcock.
 Hermann Heinrich Zornig.
 Gladeon Marcus Barnes.
 Raycroft Walsh.
 Harvey Clark Allen.
 Edward Bennett Dennis.
 Leon Moffat Logan.
 Roger Baldwin Colton.
 Enrique Urrutia, jr.
 Arturo Moreno.
 Oliver Loving Spiller.
 Ruskin Peirce Hall.
 Walter William Vautsmeier.
 James Madison White.
 Spencer Elwell Shearer.
 Frank Brezina.
 Seth Harold Frear.
 John Henry Mellom.
 Herbert Edward Pace.
 Gunnar J. Mortenson.
 John Emmitt Sloan.
 Federick Rodman Palmer.
 Alexander Wilson.
 Xavier Francis Blauvelt.
 Frank Dorwin Lackland.
 Joseph Andrews.
 Albert Samuel Peake.
 Floyd D. Garlock.
 Cushman Hartwell.
 Arthur Boettcher.
 Horace Thurber Aplington.
 Fred Livingood Walker.
 Alvan Cullom Gillem, jr.
 Rapp Brush.
 Bert Milton Atkinson.
 Edward George McCormick.
 Philip Bracken Fleming.
 Joseph Cowles Mehaffey.
 Paul Sorg Reinecke.
 Raymond Albert Wheeler.
 William Benjamin Hardigg.
 Harry Russell Kutz.
 Charles Adam Schimelfenig.
 Thompson Lawrence.
 Freeman Wate Bowley.
 Charles Reuben Baxter.
 Gustav Henry Franke.
 Hubert Gregory Stanton.
 John Everard Hatch.
 Charles Anderson Walker, jr.
 Bethel Wood Simpson.

Harold Floyd Nichols.
 Harry James Keeley.
 Charles Philip Hall.
 Alexander Day Surles.
 William Edmund Larned.
 Franklin Kemble.
 Alfred John Betcher.
 Karl Slaughter Bradford.
 Herbert Arthur Dargue.
 John Griffeth Booton.
 Frederick Gilbreath.
 George Richmond Hicks.
 James Blanchard Crawford.
 Haig Shekerjian.
 Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, jr.
 Robert W. Clark, jr.
 Harrison Henry Cocke Richards.
 Carroll Armstrong Bagby.
 Arthur Bayard Conard.
 Oliver Stelling McCleary.
 Gregory Hoisington.
 Ziba Lloyd Drollinger.
 Jesse Amos Ladd.
 Paul William Baade.
 James Roy Newman Weaver.
 John Porter Lucas.
 William Henry Harrison Morris, jr.
 Carl Fish McKinney.
 Roscoe Conkling Batson.
 Allen Russell Kimball.
 Wilfrid Mason Blunt.
 Ira Adelbert Rader.
 Alvan Crosby Sandeford.
 William Jay Calvert.
 Kenneth Ebbecke Kern.
 David Hamilton Cowles.
 Ira Thomas Wyche.
 James Craig Riddle Schwenck.
 Arthur Clyde Evans.
 John Louis Homer.
 Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian.
 George Derby Holland.
 Austin McCarthy McDowell.
 Howell Marion Estes.
 John Furman Wall.
 Leo Gerald Heffernan.
 Edwin Noel Hardy.
 Thomas G. M. Oliphant.
 Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood.
 Mert Proctor.
 Joseph Dorst Patch.
 Archibald Delos Cowley.
 William John Wrona.
 Felix Englebert Gross.
 George Ralph Meyer.
 Andrew Lewis Pendleton, jr.
 Lewis Hyde Brereton.
 Cherubusco Newton, jr.
 Vincent Paul Erwin.
 Edward Lincoln Hoffman.
 Casper Ball Rucker.
 Robert Currier Brady.
 Hugh Johnston Knerr.
 John Page Edgerly.
 George Frederick Humbert.
 Arthur Woodfin Ford.
 Reuben Noel Perley.
 Vincent Meyer.
 Joseph Ray Cygon.
 Edward Harold Hicks.
 John Holmes Birdsall.
 Herbert Elliott Taylor.
 Lindsay McDonald Silvester.
 William Middleton Grimes.
 Herbert Marshall Pool.
 Leonard Townsend Gerow.
 Henry Joseph Moody Smith.
 George Derry Murphey.
 Norman Whittemore Peek.
 William Clayton Rose.
 Wesley Frost Ayer.
 Malcolm Wheeler-Nicholson.
 Norman Potter Morrow.
 George Crawford Elsey.

James Ambrose O'Brien.
 Lloyd Edmonstone Jones.
 George Abel Sanford.
 Alexander LeRoy Padwinetz Johnson.
 Walter Ferrell Winton.
 Maxon Spafford Lough.
 Newton Napoleon Polk.
 Ford Richardson.
 Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones.
 Lester Maple Wheeler.
 Edwin O'Connor.
 Eugene Alexander Lohman.
 Kenneth Prince Lord.
 Eugene Warren Fales.
 Edward Alexander Miller, jr.
 John Taylor Rhett.
 Livingstone Watrous.
 Emanuel Villard Heidt.
 Charles Stanley Little.
 Herbert Alonzo Wadsworth.
 Harold Clifford Lutz.
 John Moore Thompson.
 George Matthew Halloran.
 William Edward Brougher.
 Medorem Crawford, jr.
 Sumner Waite.
 Albert Monmouth Jones.
 John Edward Creed.
 Harrison McAlpine.
 James Raymond Alfante.
 Gerald Ellis Cronin.
 Glenn Perrine Wilhelm.
 Andrew Goolsby Gardner.
 Albert Simon Kuegle.
 Levin Hicks Campbell, jr.
 Follett Bradley.
 Jonathan Waverly Anderson.
 Serafin Manuel Montesinos.
 Pedro Angel Hernandez.
 Harold De Forest Burdick.
 John Absalom Baird.
 Philip Guillou Blackmore.
 Henry Clarence Davis, jr.
 Theodore Rodes Murphy.
 Benjamin Noble Booth.
 Edwin French Silkman.
 Octave De Carré.
 Robert Shemer Oberly.
 Claude Martin Thiele.
 Avery Johnson French.
 Edward Montgomery.
 Shepler Ward Fitzgerald.
 Leigh Francis Joseph Zerbee.
 Coleman Wortham Jenkins.
 Wilmer Townsend Scott.
 Herbert Eugene Ellis.
 Randolph Tucker Pendleton.
 Stewart Woods Stanley.
 Kenneth Thompson Blood.
 Roy Silas Atwood.
 Samuel Franklin Hawkins.
 Jesse Lowry Sinclair.
 Oscar Krupp.
 Carleton Ula Edwards.
 Charles Thomas Stahle.
 Charles Meigs Wood.
 Edwin Joseph O'Hara.
 Alden George Strong.
 Rudolf William Riefkohl.
 John Parke Leavenworth.
 Alexander Camman Sullivan.
 Joseph Peter Vachon.
 Lloyd Baxter Bennett.
 Abraham Garfinkel.
 Pedro Diaz Dulay.
 Thomas Austin Lynch.
 Edward James Oliver.
 Albert Tucker.
 Earle La Forest Hunt.
 John Frederick Daye.
 Frederic Waldo Whitney.
 Clifford Mitchell Tuteur.
 Clarence Leslie Gilbert.
 Arthur Eugene Rowland.
 Leon R. Cole.

Lee Roland Watrous, jr.
 Leslie MacDill.
 Charles Augustus French.
 John Albert Hoag.
 Oscar Andrew Eastwold.
 Earl Herbert Metzger.
 John O'Brien.
 Vicente Rico Barros.
 Matthew John Gunner.
 Daniel Edward Murphy.
 James Ripley Jacobs.
 Julian Francis Barnes.
 Robert Scott Lytle.
 Harold Cornelius Vanderveer.
 Kenna Granville Eastham.
 Henry Terrell, jr.
 Thomas James Camp.
 Clift Andrus.
 James Powers Yancey.
 Harry Albert Musham.
 Lawrence Sprague Churchill.
 George Elmer Arneman.
 Dale Francis McDonald.
 Paul Kimball Johnson.
 Raymond Eugene McQuillin.
 Edward Hiltner Bertram.
 Hayes Adlai Kroner.
 De Forest Willard Morton.
 Allan Stuart Boyd, jr.
 Francis Clinton Vincent Crowley.
 Harry Lewis Twaddle.
 George Everett Adams Reinburg.
 Clarence Leonard Tinker.
 William Robert White.
 Donald Bridgman Sanger.
 Martin Francis Scanlon.
 William Hanson Gill.
 Frank Theodore McCabe.
 Howard Sharp Bennion.
 William Carrington Sherman.
 Roscoe Campbell Crawford.
 Milo Pitcher Fox.
 Lee Otis Wright.
 Lewis Andrews Nickerson.
 Philip Ries Faymonville.
 Russell Lamonte Maxwell.
 William Coffin Harrison.
 John Shirley Wood.
 Charles Janvrin Browne.
 Robert Henry Lee.
 William Henry Walmsley Youngs.
 David McLean Crawford.
 Oscar James Gatchell.
 John Nathaniel Hauser.
 Thomas Jay Hayes.
 Richard Emmanuel Anderson.
 D'Alary Feche't.
 Cris Miles Burlingame.
 Raymond Vincent Cramer.
 William Hale Wilbur.
 Sidney Parker Spalding.
 Byron Quinby Jones.
 Stephen Harrison MacGregor.
 James Albert Gillespie.
 Basil Duke Edwards.
 Davenport Johnson.
 James Kirk.
 Robert McGowan Littlejohn.
 Wade Hampton Haislip.
 Robert Nall Bodine.
 James Harve Johnson.
 Harry Albert Flint.
 Walter Melville Robertson.
 John Henry Lindt.
 Pearl Lee Thomas.
 Sidney Vincent Bingham.
 Bird Spencer DuBois.
 Isaac Spalding.
 Cyril Augustine Phelan.
 Harry James Malony.
 John Hartwell Hinemon, jr.
 Henry Lytton Flynn.
 Robert Fee Hyatt.
 Harold Marvin Rayner.
 Charles Nathaniel Sawyer.

Gilbert Richard Cook.
 Max Weston Sullivan.
 Stephen Marston Valmsley.
 Franklin Cummings Sibert.
 Archibald Vincent Arnold.
 John Nicholas Smith, jr.
 Stephen J. Chamberlin.
 John Traylor McLane.
 William Horace Hobson.
 Walter Glenn Kilner.
 Raymond Oscar Barton.
 James Sylvester Mooney.
 Henry William Harms.
 John Earl Lewis.
 Walton Harris Walker.
 Millard Fillmore Harmon, jr.
 John Duncan Kelly.
 Edward Chamberlin Rose.
 Albert Eger Brown.
 William Nalle.
 Gustav Jacob Gonser.
 Ralph Cadot Holliday.
 William Gaulbert Weaver.
 Charles Chisholm Drake.
 William Joseph Morrissey.
 Robert Theodore Snow.
 Henry Charles McLean.
 Frank Victor Schneider.
 Frank Joseph Riley.
 Benjamin Franklin Delamater, jr.
 Ralph Samuel Kimball.
 Roy Oscar Henry.
 Francis Bernard Mallon.
 Lathrop Boyd Clapham.
 John Dilworth von Holtzendorff.
 Carl James Adler.
 Otto Godfrey Pitz.
 Theophilus Steele.
 Lindsley Dykeman Beach.
 Burton Young Read.
 George Hubert Gardiner.
 Chester Cardwell Staples.
 Harry William Stark.
 Duncan Grant Richart.
 Oliver Mayhew Ladd.
 Archie Stanton Buyers.
 William Ayres Borden.
 Francis Tuttle Armstrong.
 Edwin Bright Spiller.
 Cecil George Young.
 Carl Andrew Waldmann.
 Paul Wesley Evans.
 Henry Armstrong Wingate.
 William Claude Washington.
 Alfred Bixby Quinton, jr.
 Hamilton Templeton.
 Bertram Frankenberger.
 John Keith Boles.
 Edward Fuller Witsell.
 Alfred Loveday Rockwood.
 Edwin Pearson Parker, jr.
 John Macaulay Eager.
 Floyd Charles Hecox.
 Carl Adolphus Hardigg.
 Terry de la Mesa Allen.
 John Chilton McDonnell.
 Carl Lewis Caphton.
 Jerome Willard Howe.
 William Rudolph Gruber.
 Otto Wagner.
 William Trigg Pigott, jr.
 Russell Brown Patterson.
 Herbert Joseph Lawes.
 Robert Crayton Williams.
 Clyde Vincent Simpson.
 Paul Xavier English.
 Estil Virgil Smith.
 Joseph Frank Richmond.
 Roy Stuart Brown.
 Troy Houston Middleton.
 Roland Francis Walsh.
 Paul Murray.
 William Daniel Faulkner.
 Herbert Merton Ostroski.
 Roy Messick Jones.
 Arthur Read Christie.

Percy Edgar Van Nostrand.
 Frederic Vinton Hemenway.
 Clarence Monroe Dodson.
 John Bernard Brooks.
 James Merriam Moore.
 John Breittling Coulter.
 Percie Cobbs Rentfro.
 William Anderson Raborg.
 Carl Jay Ballinger.
 Richard Taillefer Taylor.
 Welton Mathew Modisette.
 John Parsons Wheeler.
 Harold Aron Strauss.
 Cyril Arthur Winton Dawson.
 Richard Christian Scott.
 Sherman Leo Kiser.
 John Carl Gotwals.
 John Henry Caron.
 Howard Eager.
 John Charles Palmer Bartholf.
 Harold Thompson.
 Robert Harwood Barrett.
 Ernest Joseph Carr.
 Patrick James Hurley.
 Donald Robert McMillen.
 Hugh Broadus Keen.
 Ora Mathias Baldinger.
 Carlo Antonio Pivrotto.
 William Birkett Duty.
 Walter Owen Rawls.
 Francis Kosier Newcomer.
 Charles Francis Williams.
 Gordon Russell Young.
 Richard Ulysses Nicholas.
 Lewis King Underhill.
 James Archer Dorst.
 Rufus Willard Putnam.
 Lunsford Errett Oliver.
 William Chalmers Young.
 William Carey Crane, jr.
 Carlos Brewer.
 David Edward Cain.
 John Eugene McMahon, jr.
 Francis Augustus Englehart.
 Allen G. Thurman.
 William Ashley Copthorne.
 George Wessely Sliney.
 Selby Harney Frank.
 Eugene Tritle Spencer.
 Willis Dale Crittenberger.
 Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh.
 Alfred Bainbridge Johnson.
 Falkner Heard.
 Roland Louis Gaugler.
 Samuel John Heldner.
 Junius Wallace Jones.
 Stuart Warren Cramer, jr.
 Harold Smith Martin.
 Thoburn Kaye Brown.
 Manning Marius Kimmel, jr.
 John Huff Van Vleet.
 Leland Swarts Devore.
 Geoffrey Keyes.
 Charles Addison Ross.
 Douglass Taft Greene.
 Robert Meredith Perkins.
 Lawrence Babbitt Weeks.
 Clarence Hagbart Danielson.
 James Nixon Peale.
 John Arthur Considine.
 David Beauregard Falk, jr.
 William Cooper Foote.
 Francis Reuel Fuller.
 Clinton Warden Russell.
 William Richard Schmidt.
 Earl Lindsey Canady.
 Louis Aleck Craig.
 George Edward Lovell, jr.
 Otis Keilholtz Sadtler.
 William Henry Jones, jr.
 John Erskine Ardrey.
 Carlyle Hilton Wash.
 Henry Pratt Perrine, jr.
 Dennis Edward McCunniff.
 Henry Balding Lewis.
 Henry Barlow Chendale.

Stewart Shepherd Giffin.
Samuel Alexander Gibson.
Paul Woolever Newgarden.
Charles Andrew King, jr.
Alexander McCarrell Patch, jr.
Charles Bishop Lyman.
Robert Lily Spragins.
Ward Elverson Duvall.
James Brown Gillespie.
Charles Lawrence Kilburn.
Hans Robert Wheat Herwig.
Howard Calhoun Davidson.
William Lynn Roberts.
William Alexander McCulloch.
Paul Duke Carlisle.
William Augustus Rafferty.
Lathe Burton Row.
John Flowers Crutcher.
Francis Joseph Toohey.
George Washington Price.
Herbert Slayden Clarkson.
Charles Gardiner Helmick.
Madison Pearson.
Robert Duncan Brown.
Ray Wehnes Barker.
Henry Abbey, jr.
Earl Howard Coyle.
Mack Garr.
Edward Oliver Halbert.
Maxwell Kirby.
Frank Bonne Jordan.
Edmund Peyton Duval.
Alfred Eugene Sawkins.
Robert Emmet Carmody.
Harry Lee King.
Robert Ogden Annin.
Daniel Gordon Morrissett.
Augustin Mitchell Prentiss.
Ralph Hospital.
Theodore Barnes, jr.
Casey Hewitt Hayes.
Harvey Buckingham Steele Burwell.
Charles Bellows Hazeltine.
John Lloyd Burg.
Edward William Austin.
Russell Alger Osmun.
Sidney Erickson.
Emer Yeager.
Thomas Roger McCarron.
George Lamberton Smith.
Mahlen Augustus Joyce.
Chapman Grant.
William Henry Holcombe.
Charles Philip Gross.
Bernard August Miller.
Peter Cleary Bullard.
Brehon Burke Somervell.
Xenophon Herbert Price.
Robert Walter Crawford.
Frederick Snowden Skinner.
Dabney Otey Elliott.
Frederick William Herman.
John Hill Carruth.
Philip Loomis Thurber.
William Chester Houghton.
John Churchill Wyeth.
Arthur Ringland Harris.
LaRhett Livingston Stuart.
Alfred Earl Larabee.
John Adams Brooks, jr.
Cleveland Hill Bandholtz.
John Green Burr.
Albion Ray Rockwood.
Frank Lawrence Hoskins.
Arthur Dow Newman.
John Hamilton Jouett.
John Benjamin Anderson.
Cedric Watterson Lewis.
Joseph DeMoss McCain.
Harry Clyde Ingles.
James Lester Bradley.
Willis James Tack.
Edward Leuffer Nevin Glass.
Charles Watson Foster.
William Edward Burr.

Eugene Villaret.
Cuyler Llewellyn Clark.
Reiff Hesser Hannum.
Clarence Corinth Benson.
Thomas Henry Rees, jr.
Floyd Randall Waltz.
John Henry Woodberry.
Harold Francis Loomis.
Leland Harold Stanford.
William Abbott Robertson.
Richard Bolles Paddock.
Carl Spatz.
Harold Roe Bull.
James Byron Haskell.
Charles Morton Milliken.
James Fred Byrom.
Joseph Bradford Treat.
Woodfin Grady Jones.
James Patrick Hogan.
Paul Clarence Paschal.
John Leo Parkinson.
Rudolph Gwinn Whitten.
Louis Thomas Byrne.
Gooding Packard.
Glenn Preston Anderson.
Walter Cyrus Gullion.
Francis Marion Brannan.
Adam Emple Potts.
William Rutledge Orton.
Francis Henry Forbes.
Rufus Sumter Bratton.
Thomas George Lanphier.
Slyvester DeWitt Downs, jr.
Orlando Ward.
Benjamin Grant Weir.
Ralph Royce.
Thomas Huntington Monroe.
Roger Burnett Harrison.
Benjamin Fiery Hoge.
Frederick Herr.
Clifford James Mathews.
Howard Prescott Milligan.
Frank William Milburn.
Isaac Gill, jr.
John Kennard.
John Bellinger Thompson.
Hamner Huston.
Jens Anderson Doe.
Sheldon Harley Wheeler.
Lester Leland Lampert.
William Francis Maher.
Floyd Hatfield.
Charles Lewis Clifford.
Benjamin Seymour Stocker.
Gaston Lee Holmes.
Oscar Otto Kuentz.
Earl Landreth.
William Edward Raab Covell.
Joseph Dogan Arthur, jr.
John Stewart Bragdon.
George Jacob Richards.
John Scott Smylie.
Douglas Lafayette Weart.
Earl Ewart Gesler.
Edwin Alexander Bethel.
John French Conklin.
Alfred Laing Ganahl.
William Frazer Tompkins.
Douglas Hamilton Gillette.
Paul Alfred Hodgson.
Donald Angus Davison.
Henry Spiese Aurand.
Thomas Bernard Larkin.
Edwin Colt Kelton.
James Allen Lester.
Mason James Young.
Layson Enslow Atkins.
Herman Beukema.
Francis Joseph Dunigan.
Edwin Albert Zundel.
Clinton Wilbur Howard.
Charles Manly Busbee.
Albert Whitney Waldron.
Parley Doney Parkinson.
John Hobert Wallace.

Raymond Marsh.
 Harold Eugene Small.
 Henry Benton Saylor.
 Joseph May Swing.
 Charles Wolcott Ryder.
 Stafford LeRoy Irwin.
 Joseph Taggart McNarney.
 Albert Henry Warren.
 Omar Nelson Bradley.
 Cedric Malcolm Stanley Skene.
 Paul John Mueller.
 Leland Stanford Hobbs.
 John Frederick Kahle.
 Edwin Bowman Lyon.
 Reinold Melberg.
 Clarence Brewster Lindner.
 John Henry Cochran.
 Logan Wellington Series.
 Carl Conrad Bank.
 Charles Calvert Benedict.
 Vernon Evans.
 Roscoe Barnett Woodruff.
 Joseph Jesse Teter.
 Lewis Clarke Davidson.
 Dwight David Eisenhower.
 Harold William James.
 George Hume Peabody.
 Martin John O'Brien.
 Joseph Cumming Haw.
 James Basevi Ord.
 Earl Larue Naiden.
 Henry McElderry Pendleton.
 Iverson Brooks Summers, jr.
 Edmund de Treville Ellis.
 Robert William Strong.
 Clifford Randall Jones.
 John Beugnot Wogan.
 Clesen Henry Tenney.
 Clifford Barrington King.
 Frank Edwin Emery, jr.
 Edward Caswell Wallington.
 Carl Ernest Hocker.
 John William Leonard.
 Richmond Trumbull Gibson.
 John Aloysius McDermott.
 Edward Campbell McGuire.
 Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt.
 Edward Bolton Hyde, jr.
 John McDonald Thompson.
 James Alward Van Fleet.
 Louis Alfred Merillat, jr.
 Edward Gill Sherburne.
 Walter Wood Hess, jr.
 Michael Frank Davis.
 Ephraim Foster Graham.
 James Saye Dusenbury.
 Fredrick Clifford Rogers.
 Joseph Dowd Brown.
 Lehman Wellington Miller.
 Edson Irwin Small.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Herbert Arthur White.
 Beverly Allen Read.
 Blanton Winship.
 James Jesse Mayes.
 Edward Albert Kreger.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Gordon Nathan Kimball.
 Kyle Rucker.
 Arthur Winton Brown.
 Willey Howell.
 William Taylor.
 Dennis Patrick Quinlan.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be colonel.

Arthur Walcott Yates.

CAVALRY.

To be colonels.

Elmer Lindsley.
 William Jefferson Glasgow.
 Frank Spear Armstrong.
 John O'Shea.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Edward Leonard King.
 Samuel Field Dallam.
 William Kelly, jr.
 Henry Charles Whitehead.
 William Dixon Chitty.
 Alfred Eldrekin Kennington.
 Edward Percy Orton.
 Francis Horton Pope.
 George Edward Mitchell.

To be majors.

David Harmony Biddle.
 William Fredric Holford Godson.
 George William Winterburn.
 Lewis Foerster.
 Lewis William Cass.
 William Porter Moffet.
 Archibald Francis Commiskey.
 William Albert Cornell.
 James Etter Shelley.
 Edward Calvert.
 Bruce Palmer.
 James Edmond Fechet.
 Philip Worthington Corbusier.
 Frederick Marion Jones.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be majors.

Sherman Miles.
 Cortlandt Parker.
 Charles Carter Reynolds.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Joseph Wheeler, jr.
 Robert Emmet Callan.
 Edwin Landon.
 Clarence Henry McNeil.
 Joseph Powell Tracy.
 Percy Myers Kessler.
 Johnson Hagood.
 Frank Kirby Fergusson.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Alfred Sully Morgan.
 Charles Henry Hilton.
 William Fayssoux Stewart, jr.
 Joseph Benjamin Douglas.
 Hudson Taylor Patten.

To be majors.

Charles Edward Nason Howard.
 Claudius Milton Seaman.
 Hugh John Bedell McElgin.
 Arthur Leonard Fuller.
 Henry Rozer Casey.
 William Kern Moore.
 David Yulce Beckham.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

John McAuley Palmer.
 John Kramer Miller.
 William Newman.
 Hansford Lee Threlkeld.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Thomas McArthur Anderson, jr.
 Charles Du Val Roberts.
 Claude Hamilton Miller.
 Harold Benjamin Fiske.
 John Hendricken Hughes.
 George Willis Helms.
 Rufus Estes Longan.
 William Mason Fassett.
 Halstead Dorey.

To be majors.

Bertram Page Johnson.
 Charles Ridgely White Morison.
 Walter Lawrence Reed.
 Ira Franklin Fravel.
 Ned Merrill Green.
 James Alfred Moss.
 Philip Coldwell.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors.

William Daugherty Petit.
Jay DePew Mingos.

To be captains.

George Newlove.
Luke Baker Peck.
Frederick H. Sparrenberger.
George Philip Stallman.
Magnus J. Myres.
Ralph Waldo Newton.
Benjamin Franklin Fridge, jr.
Carlton Lakey Vanderboget.
James Brent Anderson.
Charles Henry Stearns.
Walter Leland Richards.
Francis Carrillo Tyng.
George Randolph Harris, jr.
Forrest Pitt Baker.
Frederic Hamilton Thorne.
James Roy Hudnall.
John Andrews Rogers.
Reginald Ducat.
Guy Blair Denit.
Charles R. Lanahan.
Charles Augustus Pfeffer.
Frank Hernon Chase.
Edward Raymond Easton.
Stanley Gibson Odola.
Alfred Robert Thomas, jr.
Harold Augustus Spilman.
Charles August Stammel, jr.
Wilmer Clayton Dreifelblies.
Clive Paul Mueller.
Nuckols Thornton Davie.
William Eli McCormack.
Rees Stephen Lloyd.
Zera Exley Bolin.
Louis Martin Field.
Eugen Gottfried Reinartz.
Verner Trenary Scott.
Hall Glesnor Van Vlack.
Alan Callender Sutton.
William Milton Caffee.
Horace Tyner Doust.
John DuBose Barnwell.
Everett LeCompte Cook.
Gordon Adams Clapp.
Virgil Heath Cornell.
Theodore Wallace O'Brien.
Ernest LeRoy Wilson.
George Benjamin Kent.
Harry Justin Felch.
George Heinrichs Preston.
William Campbell Colbert.
Joseph William Garrett.
Charles Levi Maxwell.
Harold Vincent Raycroft.
Wesley Cintra Cox.
Levy Steven Johnson.
Elmer Seth Tenney.
Roy Wilford Layton.
Joe Harold St. John.
Paul Moyer Patterson.
Donald H. Pitts.
William John Melhe.
Morgan Clint Berry.
Anthony Avata.
William Joseph Froitzheim.
Othel Jefferson Gee.
William Humes Houston.
Fabian Lee Pratt.
Lincoln Frank Putnam.
Thomas Hill Stewart, jr.
Eli Edwin Brown.
Wilbur Gibson Jenkins.
Richard Turberville Arnest.
Maxwell Gordon Keeler.
Jesse Cortena McKean.
Daniel Franklin.
Orlando Jefferson Posey.
Antony Joseph Greco.
Dalmar Rowley Blakely.
Charles Fletcher Davis.
David Wade Bedinger.

Adam George Heilman.
Martin Robert Reiber.
Raymond Clyde Wolfe.
Harold Arthur Kirkham.
Aubin Tilden King.
Brooke Dodson.
Oswald Felix Schiffli.
Logan Ilk Evans.
Joseph Francis Gallagher.
Alexander Mileau, jr.
Leonard Philip Bell.
Thomas Grant Tousey.
Frank Walker Young.
Roy Farrington Brown.
John Glenwood Knauer.
Clark Anson Wilcox.
Edwin Raymond Strong.
Henry Jackson Hayes.
Edwin Leland Brackney.
Rufus Leroy Holt.
Ernest Jackson Steves.
James Neal Williams.
Charles Ralph Ozias.
Cedric Eugene Filkins.
Clarence Mansfield Reddig.
Floyd Vern Kilgore.
Forrest Ralph Ostrander.
Walter Schneider Bennett.
Bernard Lipscomb Jarman.
Raymond Osborne Dart.
John Frank Lieberman.
John Darlington Nourse.
Don Clio Bartholomew.
Rae Ellsworth Houke.
Charles Roland Glenn.
William Stephen Culpepper.
Royal Kendall Stacey.
Niels Peter Paulsen.
Ebner Holmes Inmon.
George William Rice.
William Bell Foster, jr.
Joseph Wheeler Smith, jr.
James Day Edgar.
William Kenneth Turner.
Rollo Preston Bourbon.
John Christopher Woodland.
William Stanton Martens.
Walter Leslie Perry.
Harvey Robinson Livesay.
Edmund Anderson Lodge.
Samuel Carlton Gwynne.
William Ralph Campbell.
Brooks Collins Grant.
Jarrett Matthew Huddleston.
John Newton Merrick.
Albert Bowen.
Francis Elwood Weatherby.
William Davies McLelland.
Sam Hardeman.
William Charles Munly.
Robert James Platt.
John Arthur Keyton.
Alfred Edward Jones.
Tate Benton Collins.
Ralph Leslie Cudlipp.
Chauncey Elmo Dovell.
Lucius Kennedy Patterson.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains.

Edwin Moore Kennedy.
George Magnor Krough.
Howard Clayton Feyler.
Beverley Morrison Epes.
James Henry O'Reilly.
George Julian Sibley.
James Barto Mann.
Herbert Edwin Guthrie.
Charles Jefferson Denholm.
Joseph Henry Jaffer.
William Henry Siefert.
James Harold Keith.
James Jay Weeks.
Wayne W. Woolley.
Fernando Emilio Rodriguez.

Thomas Minyard Page.
Clyde Wakefield Scogin.
John Godfrey Urban.
James Lawrence Olsen.
Daniel Sumner Lockwood.
John Nelson White.
William Ferdinand Scheumann.
Campbell Hopson Glascock.
William Frederic Wieck.
Thomas Herbert Veale.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Gerald E. Griffin.
Charles Douglas McMurdo.
William George Turner.
William Vinton Lusk.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Robert Vans Agnew.
William Vinton Lusk.
William George Turner.
Joseph Richardson Jefferis.
Harry Frank Steele.
Ray Jones Stancliff.
Coleman Nockolds.

To be majors.

Ray Jones Stancliff.
Coleman Nockolds.
Robert Vans Agnew.
Eugene John Cramer.
Jules Henry Uri.
Henry Wilson Peter.
William Proctor Hill.
John Alexander McKinnon.
Charles Henry Jewell.
William Adalbert Sproule.
John Henry Gould.
Walter Fraser.
Walter Robert Pick.
Andrew Edmund Donovan.
Burt English.
Robert Julian Foster.
George Alexander Hanvey, jr.
George Albert Lytle.
Robert Cessna Musser.

To be captains.

Robert Cessna Musser.
Aquila Mitchell.
Wilfred Josiah Stokes.
James Reid Shand.
Herbert Stephens Williams.
Alfred Lewis Mason.
Thomas Harold Edwards.
Burton Alpheus Seeley.
Edward Patrick O'Connell.
George Henry Koon.
Ralph Maurice Buffington.
Daniel Buchter Leininger.
Joseph Nourse Hornbaker.

To be first lieutenants.

Sherman Robert Ingram.
George William Brower.
Allen Chamberlain Wight.
Elwood Luke Nye.
Charles Brenton Dunphy.
Robert Payne McComb.
Harold Clarke.
Daniel Henry Mallan.
Louis Goldman Weisman.
Everett Cooper Conant.
James Alexander McCallam.
Harry John Juzek.
William Henry Dean.
Solon B. Renshaw.
Horace Zenas Homer.
Louis Lathrop Shook.
Oscar E. Gladfelter.
Frank H. Woodruff.
John D. Moore.
Will Charles Griffin.
Lloyd Clifford Ewen.
Charles Oliver Grace.
Edward Michael Curley.
James Russell Sperry.

Floyd Chauncey Sager.
Henry Emil Hess.
Vincent Brown Wright.
Paul Roberts King.
Forest Lee Holycross.
George Leander Richards.
Daniel S. Robertson.
George Leslie Caldwell.
George Francis Feazell.
Jacob Landes Hartman.
Gordon Bancroft Huse.
John H. Kintner.
Walter Karl Herbott.
Arthur Dunlap Martin.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be colonel.

George Owen Squier.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplains with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Cephas Caleb Bateman.
Walter Marvine.
Charles Wright Freeland.
John Anthony Randolph.
Edmund P. Easterbrook.
George Chamberlain Stull.
Aldred Adino Pruden.
Barton Warren Perry.

To be chaplains with the rank of major.

James Lincoln Griffes.
John Menifee Moose.
Julian Emmet Yates.
David Law Fleming.
Francis Patrick Joyce.
Simon Michael Lutz.
Herbert Stanley Smith.

To be chaplains with rank of captain.

Alexander Daniel Sutherland.
Ignatius Fealy.
Haywood Lewis Winter.
Thomas Louis Kelley.
Clifford Lore Miller.

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be colonels.

Frank Spear Armstrong.
Clyde Emile Hawkins.
Louis Hermann Bash.
Harry Frederick Rethers.
Henry Charles Whitehead.
Edward Seymour Walton.
Francis Horton Pope.
Alexander Elliot Williams.
John Robert Rigby Hannay.
Charles Henry Hilton.
Albert Clayton Dalton.
Sam Frank Bottoms.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Irvin Leland Hunt.
Henry Churchill Bonnycastle.
Patrick William Guiney.
Frederick William Van Duyne.
Grayson Villard Heidt.
Lawrence Du Val Cabell.
Clyffard Game.
Albert N. McClure.
George Edward Ball.
Walter Bogardus McCaskey.
Warren Webster Whitside.
William Richard Kendrick.
George William Winterburn.
Jack Hayes.
Frederick Curtis Johnson.
Will H. Point.
William Benton Cowin.
Richard Ten Broeck Ellis.
Alvin Kelley Baskette.
Milosh Radosablavitz Hilgard.
Linwood Ellsworth Hanson.
Frank Harold Burton.
Charles Louis Willard.
Ernest H. Agnew.

William Henry Noble.
 Samuel Burnette Pearson.
 James Henry Como.
 J. DeCamp Hall.
 Harry Edward Comstock.
 William Oury Smith.
 Edgar Simon Stayer.
 Charles Ernest Reese.
 Sherrard Coleman.
 William Franklin Herringshaw.
 Robert Emmet Grinstead.
 Ernest Alexis Jeunet.
 Franklin Schoch Leisenring.
 Herbert L. Evans.
 Albert Owen Seaman.
 William Howard Tobin.
 Verne LaSalle Rockwell.
 Charles Godfrey Harvey.
 James Etter Shelley.
 Ward Dabney.
 Edward Calvert.
 Thomas Meredith Hunter.
 Frank Howard Adams.
 John Adam Wagner.
 Henry Gibbins.
 Edmond Ross Tompkins.
 George Albert Purington.
 Thomas MacAllister Knox.
 John Patrick Hasson.
 Rudolph Ethelbert Smyser.
 Robert Sterrett.
 James Perrine Barney.
 William Columbus Gardenhire.
 Joseph Cornelius Kay.
 Walter Chambers Jones.
 Franklin Potter Jackson.

To be majors.

James Robert Pourie.
 Charles Oswick Zollars.
 Augustus Bennett Warfield.
 Norton Ellsworth Wood.
 Ernest Stephen Wheeler.
 John Burhyte Wilmot Corey.
 Charles Greenough Mortimer.
 Charles Jones Ferris.
 Henry Rozer Casey.
 William Kern Moore.
 John Sherman Chambers.
 James Regan.
 William Gustin Ball.
 Gerrit VanSchaick Quackenbush.
 Sydney Herbert Hopson.
 Carl Carlton Jones.
 Charles Davis Winn.
 Ralph Noble Hayden.
 Alden Max Graham.
 Arthur James Lynch.
 Joseph Howard Barnard.
 William Holt Peek.
 George Steele Gillis.
 Milton Garfield Holliday.
 Walter Herbert Neill.
 Launcelot Marmaduke Purcell.
 Carl Frederick von dem Bussche.
 James Pryer Castleman.
 Frank Edwin Davis.
 William Elmer Murray.
 Brainerd Taylor.
 George Percy Hawes, jr.
 Charles Albert Clark.
 Charles McHenry Eby.
 William Alexander McCain.
 Joseph Fulton Taulbee.
 Odiorne Hawks Sampson.
 Norman Harry Davis.
 Samuel Sumner Bryant.
 Charles Smith Hamilton.
 George Watkins Ewell.
 Claire Raymond Bennett.
 Reuben Chapman Taylor.
 George Edgar Nelson.
 Edward Himmelwright Tarbutton.
 Emil Engel.
 Edwin Gunner.
 Resolve Potter Palmer.

Phillip Remington.
 Mark Lorin Ireland.
 Albert Howell Barkley.
 Stanley Koch.
 Edmund Bristol Gregory.
 Ursa Milner Diller.
 Arthur James Davis.
 Charles Andrew Meals.
 Napoleon William Riley.
 Thomas Norton Gimperling.
 Joseph Lybrand Topham, jr.
 John Marshall True.
 Robert Collins Eddy.
 Charles Lewis Scott.
 Ralph Talbot, jr.
 Clifford Lee Corbin.
 Everett Davis Barlow, jr.
 James Griffin Boswell.
 Max Akin Elser.
 Alexander Hamilton Jones.
 John Patrick Keeler.
 James Howard Laubach.
 Henry John Weeks.
 Charles Dudley Hartman.
 Max Robert Wainer.
 William Baldrige Loughborough.
 Merrill Dole Wheeler.
 Hans Robert Wheat Herwig.
 William Robert White.
 Edmund De Treville Ellis.
 George Derry Murphey.
 Rodman Butler.
 Robert McGowan Littlejohn.
 Fredrick Clifford Rogers.
 George Herman Huddleson.
 Frank Joseph Riley.
 Allen Russell Kimball.
 Willis Edward Mills.
 Richard Henry Jordan.
 Ernest Grave Cullum.
 Jacob Frank.
 Henry Armstrong Wingate.
 Herbert Joseph Lawes.
 Charles Carter Reynolds.

To be captains.

Norris Stayton.
 Owen Glenn Collins.
 John Thomas Harris.
 Albert Kenny Craven Palmer.
 Henry Dorsey Farnandis Munnikhuysen.
 Guy Ichabod Rowe.
 Charles Martin Everitt.
 Frank Floyd Scowden.
 Wilmot Alfred Danielson.
 Francis Joseph Torney.
 Douglas Campbell Cordiner.
 Leon Moffat Logan.
 Frederick Rodman Palmer.
 Frederick Gilbreath.
 William Jay Calvert.
 Robert Currier Brady.
 James Raymond Alfante.
 DeForest Willard Morton.
 Charles Chisholm Drake.
 Carl Adolphus Hardigg.
 Roland Francis Walsh.
 Russell Alger Osmun.
 Louis Alfred Merillat, jr.
 Marvin Conrad Heyser.
 Clarence Fenn Jobson.
 Charles Andrew McGarrigle.
 Richard Jacquelin Marshall.
 Richard Keene Smith.
 George Macdonald Herringshaw.
 Allen Thurman Veatch.
 Roy Charles Lemach Graham.
 Harley Albert Dresback.
 William Harvey Dukes.
 Reyburn Engles.
 Arnold Wright Ellis.
 Joseph Knox Fornance.
 Harry Harrison Reeves.
 Edwin Mack Scott.
 Frederick Schoenfeld.

Rene Eugene Fraile.
 Sherman I. Strong.
 Stuart Duncan Campbell.
 John Webster Lufrio.

To be first lieutenants.

William Francis Stromeayer.
 Dallas Loyd Knoll.
 Erwin Adolph Manthey.
 Harry Lee Hart.
 Douglas Lee Crane.
 George Etter.
 Clinton Bowen Flisk Brill.
 Clough Farrar Gee.
 George Jacob Giger.
 William Foelsing.
 Harry William Koster.
 Harold Stokely Wright.
 Elmer Theodore Foss.
 Frederick Philip Schlandt.
 Hans Ottzenn.
 Lewis Mesherry.
 Harvey Edward.
 Milton Orme Boone.
 John Downing Hill.
 Harry Boissonnault.

To be second lieutenants.

Joseph Worth Timmons, jr.
 Glen Dison Gorton.
 Everett Roscoe Stevens.
 Robert Howard Wylie.
 Joseph Popenjoy Bailey.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels.

Ralph Harrison.
 Robert Shufeldt Smith.
 James Canby.
 Kenzie Wallace Walker.
 Robert Sanford Olley.
 Edward Percy Orton.
 Willard Herman McCornack.
 William Franklin Clark.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Roderick Leland Carmichael.
 Alfred Sully Morgan.
 Charles Egbert Stanton.
 William McKendree Lambdin.
 William Beatty Rochester.
 Frederick William Coleman.
 Edwin Albert Hickman.
 Edward Albert Sturges.
 Theodore Schultz.
 Richard Kerr Cravens.
 Joseph Sanders Hardin.
 Samuel Breck McIntyre.
 Hilden Olin.
 Perrin Lindsley Smith.
 Freeborn Page Holcomb.
 Charles Henry Errington.
 Lewis Sidney Morey.
 William Hugh Clopton, jr.
 Leonard Lyon Deltrick.
 Tilman Campbell.

To be majors.

Charles Lewis Lanham.
 David Yujee Beckham.
 Eugene Julius Ely.
 Herbert Edward Pace.
 Frederick Wegener Boschen.
 Nathan Horowitz.
 Henry Henderson Pfeil.
 Carl Cogswell Oakes.
 Matt Combes Bristol.
 Joseph James Grace.

To be captains.

Stanley Symmes Ross.
 William Henry Menges.
 Dawson Olmstead.
 George Frederick Humbert.
 Edwin Bright Spiller.
 Walter Owen Rawls.
 Norman Daniel Cota.

John Barber Harper.
 Louis Maloney Thibadeau.
 William Maynard Dixon.

To be first lieutenants.

Fred Glover Sherrill.
 Birnie Lee Brunson.

To be second lieutenants.

William Walter Thrall.
 Wallace Fairchild Baker.
 Hardie Ambrose Violland.
 Will Thomas Taber.
 Hastie Alexander Stuart.
 Eugene Coffin.
 Francis Jewett Baker.
 Eugene Owen Hopkins.
 Elmer Ellsworth Lockard.
 Dana Woods Morey.
 Robert George Nunan.
 Selden Brooke Armat.
 George Zinn Eckels.
 Jerome Clark.
 Walter Stephens Vidor.
 Frank B. Shelly.
 Arthur A. Padmore.
 Clarence Maynard Exley.
 Otto Wilhelm Gralund.
 Horace Grattan Foster.
 James MacKay.
 Thomas Scott Pugh.
 Stephen Roscoe Beard.
 George Nicoll Watson.
 Guy Russell Doane.
 Harold George Salmon.
 Ed Norment Enders.
 Archie Henry Willis.
 Edward Tiffin Comegys.
 Horace Grant Rice.
 Ernest Palmer Hoff.
 Wilhelm P. A. T. Von Hartung.
 Montgomery Taft Legg.
 James Asa Marmon.
 Walter Davis Dabney.
 Percy Gabriel Hoyt.
 William James Lisle.
 William Alexander MacNicholl.
 Seymour Houghton Francis.
 Carl Halla.
 Charles Franklin Eddy.
 Richard LeRoy Cave.
 Alfred James Maxwell.
 Orva Earl Beezley.
 Frank Elmer Parker.
 Edwin Fairbrother Ely.
 James Bayard Haley.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be majors.

Frederick Mears.
 Bowyer Brockenbrough Browne.
 Henry Hubert Stickney, jr.

To be captains.

Robert Alexander Laird.
 Horace Herbert Braun.
 Howard Foster Clark.
 Marshall Joseph Noyes.
 Helmer Swenholt.
 William Hammond Waugh.
 James Douglas Cleary.
 Clifford E. Black.

To be first lieutenants.

Frank Wiltshire Gano.
 Roy Dayton Burdick.
 Edward Sanford Pegram, jr.
 Cecil Ray Moore.
 Glenn Hownstein Stough.
 Harold Jack Adams.
 Walter David Luplow.
 Frederick Webster Deck.
 Milton Heilfron.
 Fabius Henry Kohloss.

To be second lieutenants.

Theodore Temple Knappen.
 Wilson Burnett Higgins.

Albert Newell Tanner, jr.
Harold Thomas Miller.
James Woodrow Clark.
Louis Jacob Claterbos.
Bernard Linn Robinson.
James Hobson Stratton.
Ewart Gladstone Plank.
Harry Earl Fisher.
Donald Sylvester Burns.
Donald James Leehey.
John States Seybold.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonel.

William Allen Phillips.

To be lieutenant colonels.

William Irving Westervelt.
Herman Walter Schull.

To be majors.

Harry Birdwhistell Jordan.
Edward Marsh Shinkle.
John Henry Read, jr.
Glen F. Jenks.
Gilbert Henry Stewart.
Adam Floy Casad.
John Epps Munroe.
Townsend Whelen.
Lucien Barclay Moody.
James Kerr Crain.
Roland Webster Case.
Norman Foster Ramsey.
Philip John Radcliffe Kiehl.
Charles Gearhart Mettler.
Charles Bhaer Gatewood.
Joseph Halley Pejot.
Morgan Lewis Brett.
Earl McFarland.
Alexander Garfield Gillespie.
Thomas Lee Coles.
John Boursiquot Rose.
Charles Tillman Harris, jr.
Harry Keneth Rutherford.
Lucian Dent Booth.
Alexander William Maish.
Alexander James Stuart.
Webster Allyn Capron.
James Henry Burns.
Everett Strait Hughes.
Thomas Jefferson Smith.
Ray Longfellow Avery.
John Mather.
Charles Todd Richardson.
Clarence Edward Partridge.
Raphael Robert Nix.
James Lawrence Walsh.
Robert Sears.
Wallace Loring Clay.
Charles McHenry Steese.
Herbert O'Leary.
Willard Karle Richards.
John Erle Beller.
Julian Sommerville Hatcher.
Roland Wilbur Pinger.
William Benjamin Hardigg.
Harry Russell Kutz.
Charles Adam Schimelfenig.
William Edmund Larned.
Philip Guillou Blackmore.
Thomas Aquilla Clark.
Oscar Krupp.
Arthur Woodfin Ford.
James Brown Gillespie.
Henry Benton Saylor.
Cecil George Young.

To be captains.

Claude B. Thummel.
Dwight Knowlton Shurtleff.
Francis Henry Miles, jr.
Burton Oliver Lewis.
Kenneth Bailey Harmon.
Gladeon Marcus Barnes.
John C. Beatty.
Charles Reuben Baxter.

Hubert Gregory Stanton.
Charles Anderson Walker, jr.
Bethel Wood Simpson.
John Griffith Booton.
Glenn Perrine Wilhelm.
Henry Clarence Davis, jr.
Robert Shemer Oberly.
Lee Otis Wright.
Lewis Andrews Nickerson.
Philip Ries Faymonville.
Russell Lamonte Maxwell.
Oscar James Gatchell.
Thomas Jay Hayes.
Sidney Parker Spalding.
Leonard Lovering Barrett.
Stephen Harrison MacGregor.
James Kirk.
Robert Nall Bodine.
William Ayers Borden.
Carl Andrew Waldmann.
William Chalmers Young.
Alfred Bainbridge Johnson.
Roland Louis Gaugler.
Cleveland Hill Bandholtz.
John Henry Woodberry.
Henry Spiese Aurand.
DeRosey Carroll Cabell, jr.
Alfred Bixby Quinton, jr.
Selby Harney Frank.
Albert William Draves.
Harold Whitaker Rehm.
Hugh Chapman Minton.
Harold Albert Nisley.
James Lindley Hatcher.
Raphael Saul Chavin.
Walter Francis Vander Hyden.
Elbert Louis Ford, jr.
William Harold Joiner.
Roy Lindsay Bowlin.
Robert Newton Kunz.
Samuel Robert Kimble.
John Wesley Confer, jr.

To be first lieutenants.

William Creveling Traumbower.
Charles Henry Keck.
Grafton Sherwood Kennedy.
Cornelius Henry Menger.
Simpson Ridley Stribling.
Herman Uth Wagner.
John Marcus Erwin.
William Innes Wilson.
Grayson Cooper Woodbury.
John Bellinger Bellinger, jr.
Mark Milton Serum.
Olaf Phillips Winningstad.
Clarence Cory Harshman.
Lawrence James Meyns.
Kenneth Leeds Holmes-Brown.
George William Outland.
John Brainerd Fidler.
Theodore Christian Gerber.
James Willard Walters.
Paul Ludwig Deylitz.
James Milligan Gillespie.
Jacob Gunn Sucher.
Clarence O'Leary.
George Gage Eddy.
Lloyd Russell Rogers.
Thomas Kenneth Vincent.
Levi Monroe Bricker.
Walter Harold Soderholm.
Thomas Reed Taber.
Paul Ward Beck, jr.
James Cutler Vickery.
John Marks Moore.
Arthur Harold Luse.
William Riley Deeble, jr.
George Abe Woody.
Charles Cope Bartley.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

To be colonels.

Curtis William Otwell.
Charles Wesley Exton.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Amos Alfred Fries.

To be majors.

Earl James Atkisson.
Owen Riggs Meredith.
Rollo Curtin Ditto.
Charles Winder Mason.
Walter Campbell Baker.
Alfred Loveday Rockwood.

To be captains.

Augustin Mitchell Prentiss.
Rufus Foote Maddux.
Adrian St. John.
Egmont Francis Koenig.

To be first lieutenants.

Arthur Allen Dearing.
Charles William Walton.
Eugene Peter Henry Gempel.
Henry Maris Black.
John Templeton Newland.
William Sydney Barrett.
John Virgil Lowe.
John Reigel Embich.

To be second lieutenants.

Evan Jervis Morris.
Joseph Francis Binford.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Irving Joseph Carr.
Hanson Briscoe Black.
James Bredner Allison.
Alvin Coe Voris.
John Ezra Hemphill.

To be majors.

Robert Davis.
Walter Evans Prosser.
Joseph Oswald Mauborgne.
Karl Truesdell.
John Clark Moore.
Frank Moorman.
Owen Stedman Albright.
Alvin Gustav Gutensohn.
Thomas Charles Spencer.
Sebring Clay Megill.
David McLean Crawford.
Cedric Watterson Lewis.
Dawson Olmstead.
Joseph Fulton Ware.
Francis Greason Delano.

To be captains.

Roy Howard Coles.
John Hartwell Hinemon, jr.
Louis Blaine Bender.
George Lane Van Deusen.
Spencer Ball Akin.
Charles Nathaniel Sawyer.
Stephen Marston Walmsley.
Paul Wesley Evans.
Otis Keilholtz Sadtler.
Alfred Earl Larabee.
Harry Clyde Ingles.
Charles Morton Milliken.
Leland Harold Stanford.
Jay Drake Billings Lattin.
Henry John Schroeder.
Albert Charles Stanford.
Edward Amende Allen.
Paul Sutphin Edwards.
Walter Carroll Ellis.

To be first lieutenants.

Howard Winthrop Turner.
Carroll Arthur Powell.
John Lee Autrey.
Calvert Hinton Arnold.
Norman Lee Baldwin.
Kirke Brooks Lawton.
Paul Conover Gripper.
Leon Wilcomb Hilliard.
Wright Helm Johnson.
Harold Jack Adams.
Harry Reichelderfer.

AIR SERVICE.

To be colonels.

Chalmers Gaither Hall.
William Mitchell.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Clarence Curtis Culver.
James Edmond Fehét.
Ira Franklin Fravel.
Charles DeF. Chandler.

To be majors.

William Eugene Gillmore.
Harry Graham.
Frank Purdy Lahm.
Roy Carrington Kirtland.
Harry Westervelt Gregg.
Seth Williams Cook.
Benjamin Delahauf Foulois.
James Andrew Mars.
Jacob Winfield Scott Wuest.
Henry Conger Pratt.
Gerald Clark Brant.
William Frederick Pearson.
William Nicholas Hensley, jr.
Ira Longanecker.
George Williamson DeArmond.
Frank Maxwell Andrews.
Oscar Westover.
Henry Black Clagett.
Jacob Earl Fickel.
Rush Blodgett Lincoln.
Augustine Warner Robins.
Henry H. Arnold.
Barton Kyle Yount.
John Stephen Sullivan.
William Caldwell McChord.
John Delbert Reardan.
John Waring Simons, jr.
Lawrence Wright McIntosh.
Henry Clinton Kress Muhlenberg.
John Francis Curry.
James Eugene Chaney.
William Jay Fitzmaurice.
Horace Meek Hickam.
William Henry Garrison, jr.
Alfred Harold Hobley.
Leonard H. Drennan.
Albert Lee Sneed.
Walter Reed Weaver.
Bert Milton Atkinson.
George Everett Adams Reinburg.
Henry Lee Watson.
William Lewis Moose, jr.

To be captains.

Guy L. Gearhart.
Thurman Harrison Bane.
Harold Geiger.
John Norton Reynolds.
Robert Coker.
Frank Melvin Kennedy.
Jacob Herman Rudolph.
Elbe Allen Lathrop.
Delos Carleton Emmons.
Arnold Norman Krogstad.
Thomas DeWitt Milling.
George Howard Brett.
Walter Hale Frank.
John Gray Thornell.
Raycroft Walsh.
Frank Dorwin Lackland.
Herbert Arthur Dargue.
Harrison Henry Cocke Richards.
Ira Adelbert Rader.
Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood.
Lewis Hyde Brereton.
Edward Lincoln Hoffman.
Norman W. Peek.
Shepler Ward FitzGerald.
Follett Bradley.
Leslie MacDill.
Lawrence Sprague Churchill.
Martin Francis Scanlon.
William Carrington Sherman.
Byron Quinby Jones.

Davenport Johnson.
 Henry William Harms.
 Millard Fillmore Harmon, jr.
 John Chilton McDonnell.
 Arthur Read Christie.
 Percy Edgar Van Nostrand.
 John Bernard Brooks.
 Harold Smith Martin.
 Clinton Warden Russell.
 Earl Lindsey Canady.
 George Edward Lovell, jr.
 Carlyle Hilton Wash.
 Howard Calhoun Davidson.
 Walter Glenn Kilner.
 Henry Abbey, jr.
 Maxwell Kirby.
 Harvey Buckingham Steele Burwell.
 John Hamilton Jouett.
 William Abbott Robertson.
 Carl Spatz.
 Thomas George Lanphier.
 Benjamin Grant Weir.
 Ralph Royce.
 Clinton Wilbur Howard.
 Joseph Taggart McNarney.
 Charles Calvert Benedict.
 Michael Frank Davis.
 Hubert Reilly Harmon.
 Norman Jay Boots.
 Leo Andrew Walton.
 Thomas James Hanley, jr.
 Adlai Howard Gilkeson.
 George Edward Stratemeyer.
 Sheldon Harley Wheeler.
 Edwin Bowman Lyon.
 George Hume Peabody.
 Earl Larue Naiden.
 Henry Jervis Fries Miller.
 Ralph Pittman Cousins.
 Robert LeGrow Walsh.
 Junius Henry Houghton.
 Lloyd Neff Keesling.
 John Herbert Jones.
 James A. Summersett, jr.
 Robert Gilpin Ervin.
 Oliver Patton Echols.
 William Ormond Butler.
 William Benjamin Wright, jr.
 Vernon Lee Burge.
 Louis Eugene Appleby.
 John Albert Paegelow.
 Thomas Duncan.
 Frederick LeRoy Martin.

To be first lieutenants.

Ross Gordon Hoyt.
 William Bentley Mayer.
 Henry Pascale.
 Ralph Hudson Wooten.
 Harold Mark McClelland.
 Roland Legard Davis.
 Edwin Jacob House.
 Chester Paul Dorland.
 Russell Luff Meredith.
 Frederick John Durrschmidt.
 George Calvin Tinsley.
 Harold Eugene Sturcken.
 Cassius Hayward Styles.
 William Eugene Farthing.
 Ralph Bridges Bagby.
 Arthur Edmund Easterbrook.
 Edwin Eugene Aldrin.
 Ira Clarence Eaker.
 Romeyn Beck Hough, jr.
 Idwal Hubert Edwards.
 Early Edward Walters Duncan.
 Charles Eugene Rust.
 Albert Joshua Clayton.
 Earle Gene Harper.
 Hubert Vincent Hopkins.
 Hugh Merle Elmendorf.
 Orlo Harry Quinn.
 James Franklin Powell.

To be second lieutenants.

Theodore Julius Lindorff.
 William Henry Webb.

Haynie McCormick.
 James Desmond Summers.

CAVALRY.

To be captains.

Oliver Lincoln Haines.
 Richard Wilmer Cooksey.
 James Bowdoin Wise, jr.
 Samuel Charles Harrison.

To be first lieutenants.

Alfred Pruden Kelley.
 Donald William Sawtelle.
 Willard Gordon Wyman.
 Davis Ward Hale.
 Wade Hampton Johnson.
 Paul Louis Singer.
 John William Carroll.
 Robert MacDonald Graham.
 Robert Whitley Miller.
 Luther Lyons Hill.
 Richard Harrington Darrell.
 Irvin Henry Zeff.
 Donald Campbell Kemp.
 Lewis Augustine Maury.
 Thomas Quinton Donaldson, jr.
 Horace McParlin Woodward, jr.

To be second lieutenants.

Aladin James Hart.
 Esher Claflin Burkart.
 Thomas Eginton Whitehead.
 Alexander George.
 John Irvin Gregg, jr.
 John Russell, jr.
 John Ferral McBlain.
 Basil Girard Thayer.
 Harold Oliver Sand.
 Harlan Thurston McCormick.
 Charles Porter Amazeen.
 Alan Lockhart Fulton.
 James Miller Rudolph.
 Hayden Adriance Sears.
 John Black Reybold.
 Henry Irving Hodes.
 Clifford Augustine Taney, jr.
 Harvey Kenneth Greenlaw.
 Halley Grey Maddox.
 Snowden Ager.
 Dean LeRoy Sharrar.
 John Taylor Ward.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be colonel.

Andrew Moses.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Hjalmer Erickson.
 Eben Swift, jr.
 Clifton Ranney Norton.

To be majors.

Francis Augustus Ruggles.
 William Ducachel Geary.
 Abbott Boone.
 Herbert Hamlin White.
 George Meredith Peek.
 Benjamin Franklin Miller.
 James Hatch Van Horn.
 Clyde Leslie Eastman.
 Harry Parker Wilbur.
 John Emmitt Sloan.

To be captains.

Charles Harrison Brammell.
 Wesley John White.
 Edwin Russell Van Deusen.
 John Julius Waterman.
 John Porter Lucas.
 Thomas Jonathan Jackson Christian.
 Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones.
 Kenneth Prince Lord.
 Ralph Hospital.
 Stafford LeRoy Irwin.
 Carl Conrad Bank.
 Reese Maughan Howell.
 James Mitchell Crane.
 Douglas Jenkins Page.
 Daniel Allman Connor.
 John Murray Jenkins, jr.

Arthur Sandray Harrington.
 Thomas Sprigg Poole.
 David Wilson Craig.
 George William Lyman Prettyman.
 Henry Davis Jay.
 Ray Lawrence Burnell.
 Ray Harrison.
 Percy Gamble Black.
 Arthur McKinley Harper.
 Jay Ward MacKelvie.
 Kenneth Rowntree.
 Francis William Clark.
 Charles Elliott Ide.
 Clarence Leslie Gilbert.
 John Shirley Wood.
 Richard Bolles Paddock.
 John Beugnot Wogan.
 William Henry Jones, jr.
 Louis Thomas Byrne.
 Jesse Beeson Hunt.
 John Keliher.
 Fred Beeler Inglis.
 Walter David Mangan.
 Frank Elmer Royce.
 Albion Smith.
 Clinton Innes McClure.
 David Sheridan Rumbough.
 Larry McHale.
 Stanley Bacon.
 Henry Tacitus Burgin.
 Guy Hudson Doshier.
 Augustine Joseph Zerbee.

To be first lieutenants.

Fred Paul Clark.
 Warren Henry McNaught.
 Ralph Leslie Joyner.
 Thomas Clyde McCormick.
 Martin Robert Rice.
 Francis Henry Boucher.
 Edward Hale Brooks.
 John Melville Sanderson.
 Joseph Shelburn Robinson.
 Rudolph Daniel Delehanty.
 Elmer Hugo Almquist.
 Frank Charles Jedlicka.
 Desmond O'Keefe.
 John Hanna Welsh.
 Charles Williamson Glover.
 John Gilbert White.
 Charles Everhart Sheldrake.
 Guy Orth Kurtz.
 Louis Joseph Compton.
 William Joseph Egan.
 Leo Thomas McMahon.
 John Prosper Eckert.
 Bryan Llewellyn Davis.
 Jonathan Lane Holman.
 William Douglas McNair.
 Robert Wilson Hasbrouck.
 William Mayer.
 Moses William Pettigrew.
 Dale Milton Hoagland.
 Abraham Robert Ginsburgh.
 Warren Slaughter Robinson.
 John Wesley Russey.
 John Thomas Schnegder.
 Milo Benson Barragan.
 Oscar Alfred Axelsson.
 William Amberson Sexton.
 Joe David Moss.
 Samuel Davies Bedinger.
 John Joseph Atkinson.
 Wesley Crowell Brigham.
 Lawrence Harold Bixby.
 Samuel Marshall.
 Willard Allen Reddish.
 Norman John McMahon.
 John TerBush Bissell.
 Henry Perkins Gantt.
 Henry Cornelius Denruth.
 Horace Harding.
 Leslie M. Skerry.
 Buhl Moore.
 Arthur Breckinridge Wade.
 Russell Conwell Snyder.

John Stafford Marion Cromelin.
 Boniface Campbell.
 James Julian Pirtle.
 Francis Joseph Achatz.
 Harold Berkeley Lewis.
 Ben Curtis McComas.
 William Henry Quarterman, jr.
 William Henry Brady.
 Harry Fayette Schoonover.
 Leo Francis Crane.

To be second lieutenants.

Donald Robert Van Sickler.
 Richard Candler Singer.
 Maurice Wiley Daniel.
 Park Brown Herrick.
 Mortimer Frederick Wakefield.
 Richard Meade Costigan.
 James Perrine Barney, jr.
 Wilbur Sturtevant Nye.
 Charles Harlan Swartz.
 Millard Pierson.
 Alexander Gilbert Sand.
 Edward Thomas Williams.
 George William Bailey, jr.
 Escalus Emmert Elliott.
 Paul Earl Tombaugh.
 Wray Bertrand Avera.
 Edward Maurice Flexner, jr.
 Russell Vance Eastman.
 Francis Henry Lanahan, jr.
 Charles Wingate Reed.
 Harry Marten Schwarze.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Harry Parker Wilbur.
 David Yulee Beckham.

To be majors.

Avery Johnson French.
 George Meredith Peek.
 Henry Tacitus Burgin.

To be captains.

Robert McClean Carswell.
 Belton O'Neill Kennedy.
 Louis Aleck Craig.
 Oliver James Bond, jr.
 Theodore Rodes Murphy.
 Otto Godfrey Pitz.
 Abram Vorhees Rinearson, jr.
 Joseph Pescia Sullivan.
 Albert Charles Anderson.
 John Scott Smylie.

To be first lieutenants.

Parker Gillespie Tenney.
 Harold Taylor Brotherton.
 George Raymond Owens.
 Arthur Joseph Lacouture.
 Parry Weaver Lewis.
 Edward Wrenne Timberlake.
 Henry Lord Page King.
 Frank Johnstone Cunningham.
 Duncan Hodges.
 Watson Longan McMorris.
 Sherman Edgar Willard.
 Enrique Manuel Benitez.
 Maurice Morgan.
 Albert Cushing Cleveland.
 John Leverett Farley.
 James Leonard Hogan.

To be second lieutenants.

Martin Charles Casey.
 Joseph Harris.
 William Carleton McFadden.
 Hamilton Peyton Ellis.
 Powell Paxton Applewhite.
 Charles Whitney West.
 Herbert Carl Reuter.
 Wilmer Brinton Merritt.
 Harry Clark Wischart.
 Gustave Harold Vogel.
 Leland Stuart Smith.
 Francis Selwyn Gay.
 Wilburn Vastine Luna.
 Francis Ward Walker.

Henry Kirk Williams, jr.
Joseph Vincent de Paul Dillon.
Harold Todd Turnbull.
John Elmer Referson.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Samuel Dickerson Rockenbach.
Frank Parker.
Thomas Horace Slavens.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Willey Howell.
John Royden Kelly.

To be majors.

Hugh Screven Brown.
Louis Thomas Byrne.
William Henry Jones, jr.

To be captains.

Thomas Dewees Finley.
Alexander LeRoy Podwinetz Johnson.
Harold Lancelot Finley.
Chapman Grant.
James Hunter.

To be first lieutenants.

George David Condren.
Donald Armppriester Stroh.
John Cary Howard.
Donald Coray.
James Taylor.
Franklin Abraham Green.
Charles Henry Hagelstein.
John Leonard Whitelaw.
Henry Baldwin Nichols.
Donald Brooks Hilton.
William Aylett Callaway.

To be second lieutenant.

Edward Jenkins.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 2, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this day. Direct us in the pathway of truth, and may our lives be inspired by Thy wisdom. Comfort the home that mourns and lift the burden of the heavy laden and light the candle of Thy presence on the altar of that stricken fireside. Abide with the stricken one in the measure of a great strength, a sweet peace, and a beautiful resignation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RECESS, 6 TO 8 P. M.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess from 6 until 8 p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, when the House had up for consideration Saturday last the Agricultural appropriation bill the House asked for a conference with the Senate on certain disagreeing votes between the two Houses. The Senate did not agree to House amendments Nos. 115 and 116, and asked for a further conference upon those amendments. This fact was not called to my attention yesterday; and the House conferees, on the theory that those amendments were in conference due to the request of the House on the agreement of the Senate for a conference, proceeded to confer upon those matters. In order that any question may be obviated in the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate on amendments Nos. 115 and 116 as of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate as stated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill of the following title:

S. 4039. An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13225) providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-fifth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic for the year 1921, not to exceed \$1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the use of the Senate.

The Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 517) amending an act to provide for drainage of Indian allotments of the Five Civilized Tribes, approved March 27, 1914 (38 Stat., 310, Public No. 77), returned by the President of the United States to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, with his objections, and passed by the House on a reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10074. An act to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15543. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 4826. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905;

S. 4710. An act to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to dispose of certain trust funds in his possession;

S. 5030. An act authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphine Street in said city across the United States military reservation known as Jackson Barracks;

S. 4039. An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes";

S. 5023. An act to provide for the closing of Cedar Road between Quincy Street and Shepherd Street NW. in the District of Columbia;

S. 5000. An act directing the Mississippi River Commission to make an examination and survey of the Atchafalaya, Red, and Black Rivers, and to report plan for protection of their basins from flood waters of the Mississippi River; and

S. 4554. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation; the development of water power; the use of public lands in relation thereto; and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1921.

CONFERENCE REPORT, ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have

agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11, 14, 17, 24, 25, 32, 33, 39, 40, 41, 45, 52, 55, 58, 60, 66, 67, 68, 73, 79, 80, 83, 87, 91, 97, 100, 101, 107, and 109.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 42, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 59, 62, 63, 69, 72, 74, 75, 81, 82, 85, 86, 98, 99, 102, 103, 108, 110, 111, and 112, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$40,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed by the Senate and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That not to exceed \$600,000 from this appropriation may be expended for salaries and wages of civilian employees; not to exceed \$450,000 may be expended for commercial and existing Government-owned telephone and telegraph service; not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be expended for signal equipment for organizations; not to exceed \$7,500 may be expended for pigeon service; not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for photographic and cinematographic service; and not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for the operation and maintenance of Camp Alfred Vail"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$28,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$27,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment insert the following: "Provided, That from this appropriation not to exceed \$1,750,000 shall be expended for the pay of civilian employees; not to exceed \$1,750,000 shall be expended for power, heat, and electric current, of which not exceeding \$42,300 may be used for improvement of electric power supply system at Governors Island, N. Y.; not to exceed \$100,000 shall be expended for maintenance and repair of buildings (including repair of machinery) for laundries; not to exceed \$300,000 shall be expended for the maintenance and repair of heating apparatus (other than stoves); not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and repair of electric wiring and fixtures; not to exceed \$10,000 for the repair and exchange of typewriters; not to exceed \$4,000,000 for the operation of laundries; not to exceed \$6,500,000 for fuel; not to exceed \$8,500,000 for forage, including salt and vinegar and bedding for animals, and straw for soldiers' bedding; not to exceed \$405,000 for ice; and not to exceed \$600,000 shall be expended for stationery: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to sell as soon as possible after the approval of this act, upon such terms and under such conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the best interests of the Government, such horses and mules now being held at remount stations and posts as are not in actual use, and in any event not less than 10,000 of such animals shall be sold"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the Senate insert "\$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"*Provided*, That from this appropriation not exceeding \$3,000,000 shall be expended for the hire of labor; not exceeding \$3,500,000 shall be expended for the pay of civilian employees other than laborers; not exceeding \$75,000 shall be expended for telegrams, cablegrams, and postage; and not exceeding \$25,000 shall be expended for experimental and development work."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "roads," insert "not less than one-half by sale"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate, insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate insert "\$200,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment, restore the matter stricken out, and in the matter so restored strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by the Senate amendment insert "\$425,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "\$9,750,000: *Provided*, That 20 per cent of the foregoing amounts for arming, equipping, and training the National Guard shall be available interchangeably for expenditure for the purposes named, but not more than 20 per cent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,906,404.80"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 18, 22, 23, 34, 53, 54, 70, 71, 84, 104, 105, 106, and 113.

D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
C. BASCOM SLEMP,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
HOWARD SUTHERLAND,
HARRY S. NEW,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Authorizes the use of \$40,000 of the appropriation for contingencies of the Army, instead of \$25,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000 as proposed by the Senate, for civilian employees in connection with the sale of war supplies and the adjustment of contracts and claims.

On Nos. 2, 3, and 4: Reduces from \$25,000 to \$22,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the General Staff College, and strikes out the language in the item providing for fuel for heating.

On Nos. 5 and 6, relating to contingencies, Military Intelligence Division: Appropriates \$185,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate, and inserts authority for the hire of interpreters, special agents, and guides, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 7 and 8, relating to the Signal Service: Provides for experimentation and research and development work in the language proposed by the Senate instead of in the language proposed by the House; and inserts a substitute for the itemization of the amount provided by the House.

On No. 9: Increases from \$140,000 to \$165,000 the appropriation for the Washington-Alaska military cable.

On No. 11: Restores the authority for the payment of \$1,079.02 to Frank D. Kohn.

On No. 13: Increases from \$42,000,000 to \$46,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount for pay of officers of the line and staff.

On Nos. 14 and 15: Strikes out the increase of \$500,000, proposed by the Senate, for pay of officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps; and modifies the language, inserted by the House, so

that certain officers may be on active duty for a longer period than 15 days.

On No. 16: Increases from \$1,346,000 to \$1,413,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for pay of warrant officers; and strikes out the restriction limiting the fund to the pay of 1,000 such officers.

On No. 17: Restores the restrictions, stricken out by the Senate, on the appropriation for aviation increase to officers of the Air Service.

On Nos. 19, 20, and 21, relating to the discharge of enlisted men under 18 years of age: Inserts substitute language for the matter proposed by the Senate, providing for the discharge of such men with pay and transportation and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each man, after enlistment, shall entitle him.

On Nos. 24 and 25: Strikes out the increase of \$150,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for aviation increase to enlisted men of the Air Service; and provides, as proposed by the House, that the sum shall not be used for the pay of more than 500 men on flying status.

On No. 26: Reduces from \$1,100,000 to \$1,046,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for pay of enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts.

On No. 27: Appropriates \$3,500,000 instead of \$3,000,000, as proposed by the House and \$4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, for additional pay for length of service to enlisted men.

On No. 28: Increases from \$4,500,000 to \$5,000,000 the appropriation for pay of officers on the retired list, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 29 and 30: Makes the appropriation for clerical services at headquarters, etc., available for corps areas, and corrects the total of the item.

On No. 31: Reduces from \$200,000 to \$198,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for commutation of quarters and of heat and light.

On No. 32: Strikes out the increase of \$500, proposed by the Senate, in the pay of the expert accountant in the Inspector General's Department.

On No. 33: Strikes out the language, proposed by the Senate, making the appropriation for pay of the Army for 1921 available for pay of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

On No. 35: Appropriates \$28,000,000 instead of \$27,500,000, as proposed by the House and \$30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, for subsistence.

On Nos. 36 and 37: Appropriates \$27,000,000 instead of \$26,108,430, as proposed by the House, and \$28,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for regular supplies of the Quartermaster Corps; inserts a substitute of itemization of this amount in lieu of the itemization proposed by the House; and provides for the sale of 10,000 animals instead of 20,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 38 to 41, inclusive, relating to the authorization for contracts for fuel: Provides that such contracts shall be authorized by the Secretary of War, as proposed by the Senate, instead of by the Quartermaster General, as proposed by the House, and strikes out the language, proposed by the Senate, extending the authority to forage, subsistence, and clothing.

On Nos. 42, 43, and 44, relating to incidental expenses of the Quartermaster Corps: Strikes out authority for hire of interpreters, spies, and guides, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$7,000,000 instead of \$6,946,087, as proposed by the House, and \$7,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and inserts a substitute paragraph of itemization of this amount in lieu of the itemization proposed by the House.

On Nos. 45 to 48, inclusive, relating to transportation of the Army: Restores the paragraph of itemization of the appropriation and provides for the sale or transfer of motor trucks and automobiles in the manner proposed by the Senate, modified so as to provide that not less than one-half of the number to be disposed of shall be sold.

On Nos. 49 to 52, inclusive, relating to clothing, and camp and garrison equipage: Provides for the payment of commutation of clothing to warrant officers of the mine-planter service, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out the increase of \$1,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

On No. 55: Strikes out the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, consolidating certain items of appropriation for the Quartermaster Corps into one fund known as "General expenses, Quartermaster Corps."

On Nos. 56 and 57: Appropriates \$150,000 instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the encouragement of breeding of riding horses for the Army.

On No. 58: Restores the language, stricken out by the Senate, prohibiting the use of the appropriation for barracks and quarters for rent of offices of military attachés.

On Nos. 59, 60, and 61, relating to military post exchanges: Appropriates \$225,000 instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the language, inserted by the Senate, directing the use of \$175,000 of the amount for maintenance of "hostess houses"; and also strikes out the language making the appropriation available for such purposes as the Secretary of War may deem advisable.

On No. 62: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for roads, walks, wharves, and drainage may be available for repair of roads, walks, or wharves in connection with National Army cantonments or National Guard camps.

On No. 63: Reduces from \$188,000 to \$150,000 the appropriation for rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps.

On Nos. 64 and 65, relating to vocational training: Appropriates \$1,500,000 instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,500,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores the limitations, proposed by the House, modified so that \$100,000 instead of \$50,000 may be expended for salaries; and strikes out the limitation relative to salaries and instructors inserted by the Senate.

On No. 66: Strikes out the increase, proposed by the Senate, from 5 cents to 6 cents per mile in the commutation of travel expenses for members of civilian rifle teams.

On Nos. 67 to 69, inclusive, relating to quartermaster supplies, Reserve Officers' Training Corps: Strikes out the increase, proposed by the Senate, from 5 cents to 6 cents per mile in the travel allowance; strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, medical attendance and supplies for members at such camps.

On No. 72: Reduces from \$2,500,000 to \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the Medical and Hospital Department.

On No. 73: Strikes out the increase of \$5,000, proposed by the Senate, for the Army Medical Museum.

On No. 74: Increases from \$12,500 to \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for the library of the Surgeon General's Office.

On No. 75: Reduces from \$22,000 to \$20,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for incidental expenses of engineer depots.

On No. 76: Appropriates \$35,000 instead of \$30,000, as proposed by the House, and \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Engineer School.

On No. 77: Appropriates \$25,000 instead of \$100, as proposed by the House, and \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for military surveys and maps.

On Nos. 78 and 79, relating to military roads, bridges, etc., in Alaska: Appropriates \$425,000 instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the authority, stricken out by the Senate, for the expenditure of \$10,000 of this sum for a specific investigation and report on roads and trails.

On No. 80: Restores the decrease of \$250,000, proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for current expenses of the ordnance service.

On No. 81: Reduces from \$750,000 to \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores and ammunition.

On No. 82: Reduces from \$400,000 to \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for small-arms target practice.

On No. 83: Reduces from \$500,000 to \$300,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for manufacture of arms, and strikes out the language of reappropriation of the 1921 balance for use in the fiscal year 1922.

On No. 85: Reduces from \$500,000 to \$400,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for automatic machine rifles.

On No. 86: Inserts authority in the appropriation for the Chemical Warfare Service for libraries and subscriptions for periodicals.

On Nos. 87 to 95, inclusive, relating to arming, equipping, and training the National Guard: Strikes out the increase of \$250,000, proposed by the Senate, for forage and bedding for animals; appropriates \$1,300,000 instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for help for care of matériel, animals, and equipment; appropriates \$6,000,000, instead of \$5,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$7,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for camps of instruction; appropriates \$225,000 instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the House, and \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of military service schools; restores the reduction of \$130,000, proposed by the Senate, in the amount for pay and allowances of officers detailed with the Army; appropriates \$85,000 instead of

\$75,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate, for travel of Federal officers in connection with the National Guard; appropriates \$175,000 instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate, for transportation of equipment and supplies; appropriates \$60,000 instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of sergeant instructors; appropriates \$9,750,000 instead of \$9,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for pay of National Guard, and provides that 20 per cent of all the amounts may be interchangeable instead of consolidating all of such sums in one fund, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 96 and 97, relating to arms, uniforms, etc., for field service of the National Guard: Appropriates \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the House, and \$6,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the authority, inserted by the Senate, for the issue of 3,500 animals to the National Guard.

On No. 98: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, for the sale of ordnance equipment in connection with rifle ranges for civilian instruction.

On Nos. 99 to 103, inclusive, relating to civilian military training camps: Provides for altering and cleaning uniforms, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the increase from 5 to 6 cents per mile for travel allowance; strikes out the increase of \$500,000 in the appropriation; reduces the age limit for admission from 45 years to 35 years, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out the language, proposed by the House, for the issuance of used or salvaged uniforms.

On Nos. 107 to 112, inclusive, and 114, relating to the Military Academy: Provides retirement privileges for the master of the sword; strikes out the appropriations, inserted by the Senate, for extra pay of officers of the Army on detached service at the Military Academy; and decreases the appropriations for three sergeants, as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 10: Relating to the appropriation for the Air Service.

On No. 12: Relating to certain payments made by United States disbursing officers to the Lonoke Chamber of Commerce, Lonoke, Ark.

On No. 18: Relating to the appropriation for pay of enlisted men of the line and staff.

On No. 22: Authorizing the Secretary of War to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men.

On No. 23: Providing, in the reduction of the Army, for the maintenance of 60 per cent of the strength of the various branches of the Army as prescribed in the Army reorganization act.

On No. 34: Extending the appropriation for pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 to provide for the payment of pay claims growing out of service in the World War.

On No. 53: Relating to the settlement of clothing accounts of enlisted men.

On No. 54: Relating to the issuance of uniforms under the act of February 28, 1919, to discharged enlisted men.

On No. 70: Making the appropriation for quartermaster supplies for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps available until December 31, 1922.

On No. 71: Limiting to \$7,000,000 the amount of funds heretofore appropriated for inland and port storage and shipping facilities which may be expended during the fiscal year 1922.

On No. 84: Appropriating \$10,000 for national trophy and medals for rifle contests.

On No. 104: Providing for the grade of lieutenant general for two general officers.

On No. 105: Providing for the issuance of the award of the distinguished service cross or the distinguished service medal in certain cases.

On No. 106: Appropriating \$200,000 for increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia.

On No. 113: Providing for public quarters and fuel and light for two civilian instructors at the Military Academy.

D. R. ANTHONY,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
C. BASCOM SLEMP,
T. U. SISSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order there is no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Gallagher	Langley	Rodenberg
Baer	Gandy	Lee, Calif.	Rowan
Bland, Ind.	Garner	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Britten	Garrett	Leshner	Sanders, La.
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Lomorgan	Schall
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Scully
Burke	Graham, Ill.	McFadden	Sears
Butler	Graham, Pa.	McGlennon	Sells
Caldwell	Hamill	McKinley	Small
Cantrill	Hamilton	MacGregor	Steele
Casey	Hardy, Tex.	Magee	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Mo.	Harrell	Maher	Stinnes
Classon	Harrison	Mann, S. C.	Strong, Kans.
Cole	Haugen	Milligan	Sullivan
Costello	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Thomas
Curry, Calif.	Hulings	Moon	Tincher
Denison	Hutchinson	Mooney	Tinkham
Dent	James, Mich.	Morin	Towner
Dewalt	Jeffers	Mudd	Upshaw
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Vare
Dooling	Johnston, N. Y.	O'Connor	Venable
Doremus	Juul	Pell	Voigt
Doughton	Kahn	Phelan	Watkins
Eagle	Kendall	Rainey, Ala.	Welling
Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kettner	Ramsey	Young, Tex.
Evans, Mont.	Kincheloe	Randall, Wis.	
Fish	Kitchin	Reavis	
Focht	Kleczka	Riddick	
Frear	Kreider	Riordan	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, as the bill making appropriations for the support of the Army for the next fiscal year passed the House it carried a total of approximately \$331,000,000 for the support of the Army and the Military Academy. As brought back on this conference report the bill carries a total approximately of \$341,000,000 for those purposes. The House yields to the Senate on a total of approximately \$10,000,000, and the Senate yielded to the House on items approximating about \$12,000,000, and there remains in disagreement about \$10,000,000. The conferees are in entire agreement on practically all the items in the bill with the exception of two, one relating to the size of the Army, which is still in disagreement, the House standing for its appropriation to sustain 150,000 men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts and flying cadets, and the Senate contending for an appropriation sufficient to maintain 175,000 men. The other item that is in disagreement is that providing for the appointment of two lieutenant generals in the Regular Army from among those who commanded field armies in France. We are also in technical disagreement on 13 other items which contain legislation which, of course, will be presented to the House for its approval in the regular order. We feel that the bill as it comes back to the House at this time contains provisions to further secure the House view of the way appropriations should be made for the Army. I want to call the attention of the House particularly to the amendment which provides that no officer or no enlisted man shall be maintained in the Army further than the amount of money which we appropriate in this law will pay for, and that, in my opinion, will forever put a stop to deficiencies in the pay of the Army from this time on.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I suppose the gentleman took into consideration in connection with such an amendment the embarrassment that might arise if the administration sought to increase the Army in an emergency, without having authority from Congress to recruit the number of men so increased?

Mr. ANTHONY. We felt that Congress has been in recent years so continuously in session and would be so continuously in session in the future that it would be perfectly feasible for the Executive to apply to the Congress for any extension of such power.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman realizes, with his long experience on the Committee on Military Affairs, that one of the reasons why the foundation law of the Army never fixed arbitrarily the number of men to be maintained from year to year was because we sought to continue the policy that gave an elastic control to the administration in the event of an emergency, which did not make it necessary for the administration to come to Congress and in that way advertise the emer-

gency when conditions might be delicate, and thus perhaps irritate the very conditions themselves and bring on what the administration sought to avoid.

Mr. ANTHONY. But the gentleman himself well knows the abuses to which that elastic power has been subjected only just recently.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do; but I also know that it is an ancient maxim that an abuse of anything is not an argument against its proper use.

Mr. ANTHONY. We thought we would provide so that the things which have happened in the last 60 days in the way of recruiting 40,000 more men in the Army than Congress intended could not happen again.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I quite sympathize with the gentleman in the recognition of the evils and mischief we have to contend against. I merely question the remedy. I am afraid the remedy will sometimes make us embarrassment that will prove quite as serious as the evil we are now trying to correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I understood the gentleman, in addition to the size of the Army and the two lieutenant generalships, there are 13 other amendments to be voted on by the House, separately.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In what order will the vote be taken?

Mr. ANTHONY. In the order in which they appear in the bill. If the gentleman will look at the printed copy of the conference report, he will see the amendments numbered at the end.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it true that additional provision was made by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees to the extent of \$4,000,000 for the pay of additional officers in the Army over the sum carried in the House bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is an increase of about that amount made in the item for the pay of officers, but it is not an addition to the number of officers. We are providing for the pay of 14,000 officers, but in the calculations made by the House we found we had not appropriated sufficient money to provide for their full pay. The condition arose in this way: The average pay of Army officers heretofore, all grades, from generals down to second lieutenants, has been \$3,055 a year in money. There are pending in the Senate now promotions for practically every officer in the regular service, and when the Senate confirms that promotion list, as it probably will, it will give every one of these men an additional rank. That will necessitate the increase to which the gentleman refers, and the amount dates from the time these nominations were sent to the Senate, some months ago.

Mr. BRIGGS. Therefore the amount carried in the bill does not seek to make provision for any additional officers.

Mr. ANTHONY. With the limitation to which I previously referred in my discussion with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], the number will be limited to 14,000 officers.

Mr. BRIGGS. The number was substantially that at the time the bill passed the House?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. BRIGGS. There are practically 14,000 officers now?

Mr. ANTHONY. At present there are 13,100. We did not consider the increased grades, and they have not gotten them yet, but we are advised that the Senate intends to confirm that list.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understand that the promotions are being confirmed now.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. As I understand, you have not agreed upon the size of the Army as yet?

Mr. ANTHONY. We have not.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The House is still insisting upon an Army of 150,000 men?

Mr. ANTHONY. We intend to ask the House to further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment in that respect.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And yet you have prohibited a deficiency being created. Suppose the House insists upon the Army being 150,000, how are you going to pay the Army that is now 238,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. A sufficient number of men will have to be discharged to bring it down to fit into the amount of money that we appropriate.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Right away.

Mr. ANTHONY. Within a reasonable time.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. OLNEY. Will there be sufficient time for those Members who are in favor of the Senate amendment appropriating for an Army of 175,000 men to debate this question? Would it not be wise to fix a time? I think it is a very important item.

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be no attempt to shut off reasonable discussion.

Mr. OLNEY. I would like at least five minutes in behalf of the Senate amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. There will be no attempt to shut off discussion of such matters as that.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Are these amendments to be taken up in order?

Mr. ANTHONY. Each one in the order in which it is written in the report.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I notice in amendment No. 22, which I suppose is the one referred to a while ago, when the gentleman spoke of provision being made for discharges, that it authorizes the Secretary of War in his discretion to grant discharges.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Inasmuch as you have amendment No. 23 following, would it not be better to have a direction to the Secretary of War to grant all discharges with that limitation of 60 per cent?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; because there is another amendment contained in the bill which provides that the Army must not be maintained larger than the amount appropriated for, so that it forces automatically the reduction of the Army.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield first to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. I wanted to know what is the additional amount of money in the conference report in excess of the amount which was set forth for the officers because of their advance in rank.

Mr. ANTHONY. There is about \$8,000,000 increase in the report. There is also \$1,900,000 increase in the item for air service, which will be submitted to the House.

Mr. QUIN. For a vote?

Mr. ANTHONY. For a vote, because the same paragraph contains an item of legislation which calls for its submission to the House.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will permit right there, I would like to ask in regard to the proposition of \$200,000 for increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia. Is there anything in the proposed plan that will interfere with the final development of the water power at Great Falls?

Mr. ANTHONY. The House conferees yielded reluctantly on that amendment, but I am thoroughly satisfied that there is nothing in the statement that the construction of a tunnel to provide additional water will interfere in the slightest with the development of power at Great Falls. In fact, I discussed that matter this morning with Secretary Baker, and he says there is nothing in that contention; and my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has discussed it with Col. Kutz, the engineer commissioner, and he confirms that statement.

Mr. SNELL. I did not know but perhaps there might be something in the report.

Mr. ANTHONY. Both Secretary Baker and Col. Kutz say it will not interfere.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If I may be permitted, a consideration of the facts will show that there is not the slightest ground for believing that the two plans are in any way associated so that the water-power scheme would be interfered with if this is done.

Mr. SNELL. I could not understand how it could be.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is an impossible proposition.

Mr. TILSON. I have heard it suggested that as a matter of economy the tunnel be not built but that the dam be built at once down at Chain Bridge, where sufficient power can be developed to pump the water instead of having it come down by gravity through the tunnel; and that this plan would be some \$5,000,000 cheaper for an additional water supply, besides furnishing a very large amount of power. Has this suggestion been made to any committee of Congress?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not say.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that question is not now before the House.

Mr. TILSON. It was being discussed, and I thought it was before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield? Would it not please the gentleman in charge of the bill better if gentlemen would withhold their inquiries with regard to the questions not

in controversy in the conference report until the conference report is disposed of, and then take up the other questions?

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit, the trouble with that is that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests that we withhold inquiries in reference to matters in agreement.

Mr. MONDELL. With regard to matters that will be voted upon by the House later.

Mr. ANTHONY. This matter will have a separate presentation in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. There are certain matters in the conference report that ought to be disposed of at this time.

Mr. WINGO. Now, take amendments 19, 20, and 21, that cover the case of discharges. Let me see if I understand what the action is. If I understand it, the House has receded from its disagreement to amendments 19 and 21, and receded from amendment No. 20 and concurred with an amendment, so that the language would read—see if I have the correct language:

The Secretary shall discharge from the military service with pay and travel allowances—

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I would like you to state the language as it would be.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say to the gentleman that we thought the Senate had perhaps erred in making three amendments of that item. That should have been covered in one amendment.

Mr. WINGO. That is true.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have been forced to carry that in three, because the third one has new matter in it; but from the way we have perfected the paragraph it will read like this:

The Secretary of War shall discharge from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him, all enlisted men under the age of 18 on the application of either of their parents or legal guardian, and shall also furnish to each transportation in kind from the place of discharge to the railroad station at or nearest to the place of acceptance for enlistment, or to his home, if the distance thereto is no greater than from the place of discharge to the place of acceptance for enlistment, but if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of acceptance for enlistment.

Mr. WINGO. Now, the gentleman has read the language that has been agreed to?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINGO. You cut out the words "honorably discharged"?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINGO. But you provide that they shall be given such a discharge as his service after enlistment warrants?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WINGO. Does that mean that the fact that he has misstated his age in making his enlistment shall not be used against him?

Mr. ANTHONY. It means that we provide here for a waiver of any violation of military regulations that the young man may have incurred when he made the false statement in regard to his age at the time of enlistment. We take his record after enlistment.

Mr. WINGO. He gets an honorable discharge, notwithstanding the misstatement he has made before his enlistment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, you propose to eliminate the misstatement as to age on the record as to whether or not he is entitled to an honorable discharge?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. The conferees have tried to meet the sentiment of the House in this paragraph.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I agree with the gentleman that these amendments should be taken up in the order in which they come in the report, but inasmuch as certain statements have already been made in regard to amendment No. 106 in relation to the water supply from Great Falls it seems to me this further statement ought to be made at this time: Certain Members here have said that this would not in any way interfere with the development of the Great Falls water power. I do not know what means of information they have on that point, but the gentleman knows that eminent engineers do not agree on that point, and that there is a difference of opinion in regard to it on the part of engineers who have looked into the matter.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will be glad to state it to the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. Yes. I wanted to make that statement, in view of what has already been said.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is the gentleman willing to allow a vote on the question of the administration being able to create a deficiency?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is not in the conference report.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You realize that you have destroyed the Army reorganization bill, do you not?

Mr. ANTHONY. I realize that we have put safeguards around it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Can you indicate the language in which can be found this limitation on the size of the Army by making it impossible to bring in a deficiency bill?

Mr. ANTHONY. That will come up in its regular order for discussion. It is not included in the conference report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In reference to amendment No. 20, in relation to these discharges, it strikes out the words "traveling allowances" and inserts "transportation in kind to the railroad station at or nearest to the place of acceptance for enlistment." The conferees agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out the language inserted by the Senate and inserting in lieu thereof this language: "With the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him," and this is the way it will read: "The Secretary of War shall discharge from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of each, after enlistment, shall entitle him." Now is it the intention to cut out entirely the matter of transportation?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; we provide that he shall be allowed transportation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Where?

Mr. ANTHONY. On amendment 22 we offer this additional language: "And the Secretary of War is authorized."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not one of the amendments you have agreed to?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it is not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ANTHONY. We agreed to the first two, but could not agree to 21.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I did not so understand.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 14 of the printed bill, after the word "craft," in line 2, strike out the remainder of the line and all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, down to and including "\$250,000," on line 13, and insert "\$23,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees; and not exceeding \$400,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium: *Provided further*, That not less than \$5,000,000 thereof shall be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment: *Provided further*, That not less than \$7,000,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories: *Provided further*, That claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Chief of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$10,000: *Provided further*."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Mr. ANTHONY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the Senate insert the following: "\$21,100,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 from this appropriation may be expended for pay and expenses of civilian employees other than those employed in experimental and research work; not exceeding \$250,000 may be expended for experimentation, conservation, and production of helium; not exceeding \$4,300,000 may be expended for experimental and research work with airplanes or lighter-than-air craft and their equipment, including the pay of necessary civilian employees; not exceeding \$500,000 may be expended for the production of lighter-than-air equipment; and not exceeding \$350,000 may be expended for improvement of stations, hangars, and gas plants: *Provided further*, That not less than \$5,500,000 shall be expended for

the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts, and accessories: *Provided further*, That claims not exceeding \$250 in amount for damages to persons and private property resulting from the operation of aircraft at home and abroad may be settled out of the funds appropriated hereunder, when each claim is substantiated by a survey report of a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer of the nearest aviation post and approved by the Chief of Air Service: *Provided further*, That claims so settled and paid from the sum hereby appropriated shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$10,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, we had to bring this item for appropriations for the Air Service back to the House in order to reinstate the language as to the payment of claims for damage not to exceed \$250. That language had been carried for several years, but it was stricken out on a point of order. The Senate erroneously attached it to the appropriation paragraph, so that we had to bring the whole paragraph back to the House in this shape.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. I notice in the amendment that the amount called for for new airplane equipment is \$5,500,000, which is a million and a half more than the House provided a few days ago.

Mr. ANTHONY. Correct.

Mr. HICKS. Can the gentleman explain the necessity for that increase over what the House decided was proper?

Mr. ANTHONY. The Senate demanded \$7,000,000 for new production and we yielded a million and a half.

Mr. HICKS. Did they specify what that equipment would consist of?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes. We went into the types in conference. It is to equip the Army with complete new types of planes; most largely of pursuit and bombing and attack types.

Mr. HICKS. Are some of them these foreign planes that we have seen spoken of in the paper—the Caproni, and German all-metal?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; none of them.

Mr. HICKS. Is it all for domestic production?

Mr. ANTHONY. We hope it will go into the type of all-metal planes. We have procured a number from Germany, of the all-metal planes. At the Dayton plant the air service are flying every day, many hours a day, one of these German all-metal planes, to determine how long it can stay in the air without crystallization. We want to ascertain what the life of the all-metal plane is before we go into the production of them.

Mr. HICKS. As I caught the reading of the amendment I understand that this \$5,500,000 is to be exclusively for heavier-than-air equipment. Where do you take care of the lighter-than-air equipment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Five hundred thousand dollars of it is for lighter than air. We limit them to not exceed that amount.

Mr. HICKS. Is that mentioned in the amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is.

Mr. HICKS. I did not catch that in the reading of the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. They wanted to expend a vastly larger sum for lighter-than-air machines, but we limited them to \$500,000.

Mr. HICKS. I am very glad you did.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The Senate provision fixed a minimum below which they can not go for experimentation. I understand that the House has fixed a maximum above which they can not go.

Mr. ANTHONY. We provide a minimum. We want to compel them to expend that amount of money for production.

Mr. FESS. I mean for experimentation. You have fixed a maximum above which they can not go.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is it not very unusual to say to them, "You shall not expend less than a certain amount"?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is for the reason that we have been trying to get the Air Service to build modern machines. The appropriations made in the Army appropriation bill for the last two years for new production have not all been expended. Only in the last month or two contracts have been let covering many millions of dollars that we have appropriated. The Army all the time has been crying that it has not got up-to-date machines, when the money that Congress appropriated has not been expended. They have been waiting until they could agree on the right type. This year they think they have got the type, and contracts have been let within the last month or two for almost the totals of the appropriations we have made for the last two years. We want to make them spend that money and get these up-to-date planes, so our Army will have the latest thing in the air.

Mr. FESS. The task that has been imposed on Congress is not that we must expend so much money, but that there must

be a minimum expenditure of money. After rereading the amendment I note that the amount provided for in this particular item is not increased, but you simply provide that a certain proportion of it shall be spent for this particular purpose.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is true.

Mr. FESS. And it does not increase the sum total.

Mr. ANTHONY. We itemized this appropriation and put the limitations on the expenditure for fear if we left it in a lump sum it would be expended for purposes from which the Army would not get any real benefit.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Is the type of metal plane that is now being experimented with at the Dayton field the all-metal monoplane?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is. It is the German type of plane.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Is it the Junker plane?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There have been some accidents in the postal air service in connection with the use of the Junker plane, and I wondered if it was the same plane.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman's amendment provides that not less than \$5,500,000 shall be expended for the purchase of new planes. Now, they are making experiments with these new metal planes to determine how long it will take them to crystallize. Suppose it takes a little while to determine that. I take it that they are not prepared at present to make these metal planes on a large scale anywhere in the country?

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think it rather drastic to say that they must find out whether these metal planes will be serviceable and last long enough to justify their adoption, and at the same time require them to spend \$5,500,000 during the next fiscal year, although they may not come to a determination about the metal planes until toward the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. ANTHONY. The situation in our Army to-day with reference to the air is that our flyers have to go up in the D. H.-4 plane, evolved during the war, and the opinion of our flyers is that the D. H.-4 is an out-of-date, antiquated, and unsafe machine to go into the air in. We want to compel the Air Service to provide up-to-date machines for our flyers, and that is why we put in the provision to construct machines of the latest type.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will not this be the result? You compel them to spend the money. They may have to go out and spend the money in buying up old, out-of-date airships.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; they will not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Because they have not yet determined that the new type of machines are serviceable. They are still experimenting with metal machines. They do not know whether they want to construct metal planes or not, because they do not know whether they will last long enough to pay for constructing them.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not this the situation: There is a demand in the Army for a certain expenditure for other purposes than the purchase of new planes. There is also a demand for a considerable expenditure for new planes. Now, except for this provision that has been referred to, the Army could spend this entire appropriation for other purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. To hire civilian employees—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; the amendment carries a limitation, and they could not do anything of the kind.

Mr. ANTHONY. They could if we did not put in this limitation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The limitations are there. What is the use of saying they can spend the money for other purposes?

Mr. MONDELL. Strike out this limitation to use the \$5,000,000—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not a limitation; that is a direction to spend the money.

Mr. MONDELL. "If you spend this money, you shall spend it for new planes. If you do not need new planes, you shall not spend it."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not what it says.

Mr. MONDELL. That is exactly what it says.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman has not read the amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman made a statement that the Army was not prepared to build the latest type of plane. The only question at issue is whether they will build that type of metal plane or of wood. The Army has developed a type of pursuit plane, one of the fastest pursuit planes that has been developed anywhere in the world. We have developed a type of bombing plane and ground-attack plane which they say is the last word unless they are made out of metal. Our fliers are clamoring to be given the latest type. If we have to hold back the production, if we have to wait two years, we will have no planes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They can spend the \$5,000,000 on other planes regardless of whether they adopt the metal plane or not.

Mr. ANTHONY. I hope they will spend it for the all-metal type.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It will have to be, although my genial leader, who has not read the amendment, says they may do so and so, when the amendment says that not less than \$5,000,000 shall be spent for the production and purchase of new airplanes, and so forth. I can read the English language and understand what it says.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows that this money can not be spent unless for a certain specific purpose, and the intent of that is to prevent the military authorities from spending the \$5,000,000 for other purposes in case they do not desire to spend it for new planes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman is again entirely mistaken. The language of the amendment is that not to exceed \$4,000,000 is to be expended for the pay and expenses of civilian employees, and not to exceed a certain amount for other purposes. Those limitations are in the amendment, and then there is a part of the amendment that follows that not less than \$5,000,000 shall be expended for the production and purchase of new airplanes.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When a man knows he is mistaken he ought to admit it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. They might have put it in a different form. They might have said that not more than so much shall be expended for this particular purpose, and it would be equally effective, except for the fact that in that event the money could be used for other purposes. They put it in a form to make it clear that it could not be spent for any other purpose, because that was what they wanted. It is made clear that they could not spend this money for any other purpose.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is an item in the bill for miscellaneous expenses that is covered by about two pages of the language in the bill.

If this limitation should be written that "not more than" so much was for new production, anything that was not spent for new production could be expended for anything covered by the language of the bill on which there was not an express limitation, and there are many things that are not limited. We did not want to give them any opportunity to cut down new production and use it for miscellaneous items that are not limited. Hence, the desire of the committee being for new production, we fixed a minimum.

Mr. MONDELL. In other words, if they expend this particular sum of money it must be expended for new planes?

Mr. CRAMTON. It must be.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, if they do not deem it wise to buy new planes they will not expend the money?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And violate the law. The gentleman from Wyoming complains about the Secretary violating the law.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois is too good a parliamentarian and too good a constructionist of legislative language to believe that because we say a certain amount shall be expended for a certain purpose, it means that it must be expended whether or no there is good reason for expending it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is the exact fact. It does mean that it must be expended, and that is the reason it is offered in this form, as stated by the gentleman—to make them expend it in purchasing new planes.

Mr. MONDELL. If they spend it at all.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Now that these two leaders have gotten their difficulties settled so that none of us understand the matter, I would like to ask the gentleman a question about helium. I notice in the House bill \$100,000 was carried for experimentation in helium. That amount was raised by the Senate to \$400,000 and the conferees have reduced it to \$250,000. Is the gentleman, in his own mind, convinced that the helium situation in Texas is such that it warrants the expenditure at the present time of \$250,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am not so convinced, but other members of the committee of conference felt the necessity for continuing this appropriation, and we yielded in the degree mentioned by the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Can the gentleman say what is the estimate of life of an airplane in the Army service?

Mr. ANTHONY. The experts have been greatly disappointed at the life of an airplane. For instance, statements are made to us that of the thousands of D. H. 4's that we have on hand, which were considered fine machines a year or two ago, simply two years of storage has caused them to so deteriorate that before they take those machines up into the air they will have to practically rebuild them. The glue and other ingredients used in joining them together seem to give way, and it necessitates their practical reconstruction.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I asked the question for this reason: If our flyers are going to be occupied, the Army must procure the planes, and I think it is well to direct the Army officers in Army management, that they shall purchase the necessary planes for the flyers to use, and if the life of a plane is not beyond a year then that provision must be made annually.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. I want to make inquiry with respect to the appropriations about aircraft. Did we carry such an appropriation in the last appropriation act—that is, a directory item for the expenditure of money for experimental work in lighter-than-air machines?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think we ever carried that item.

Mr. GARD. I refer to the item in lines 17, 18, and 19, on page 14, in amendment No. 10, which seems to me to be directory in respect to the expenditure of \$5,000,000 for experimental purposes. Whether or not that is the gentleman's contention I do not know, but I am asking if there has been any provision heretofore for an appropriation of that kind for that purpose?

Mr. ANTHONY. My recollection is that there has been no explicit expenditure for an experimentation in lighter-than-air machines, but in this bill we provide \$500,000 to be spent for the production of lighter-than-air craft, and we provide that \$5,500,000 must be expended for new planes.

Mr. GARD. The item to which I refer is the \$5,000,000 item in lines 17, 18, and 19, on page 14.

Mr. ANTHONY. The Air Service wanted a large appropriation for an engineering plant, for engineering and development work in balloon service, but the committee did not deem it advisable to grant it at this time.

Mr. GARD. My question went to the \$5,000,000 item.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 15, after line 16, insert: "That payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States to the Lonoke Chamber of Commerce, Lonoke, Ark., under and pursuant to a lease dated March 20, 1919, providing for the use and occupation by the United States of certain lands near Lonoke, Ark., for aeronautical purposes and providing for an increased rental from and after January 1, 1919, are hereby ratified and confirmed."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 17, line 5, strike out "\$72,678,659" and insert "\$83,000,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I have offered a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides for an expenditure of \$83,000,000, designed to establish for the ensuing fiscal year an Army approximating 175,000 enlisted men. I realize that this subject is not new, and we all appreciate that in the haste with which it is necessary to do a good many things at this time, it would be unprofitable to ex-

pend much of our opportunity debating many of the details that are involved in such a very important policy as the size of the Army.

I merely want to emphasize the position that I have taken repeatedly before this House and which I have attempted at times to explain, that we are not now appropriating for a fighting Army, an actual force that is to be relied upon for national defense in and of itself, but we are appropriating for an Army which in peace time is a national police force, that is to garrison our outlying possessions, that is to instruct itself in military science, and that is designed to be a school for the instruction of the great civil population either in their National Guard activities or in the other ways in which they seek experience that will enable us in time of emergency, in time of war, to summon with some degree of training the great citizen army on which we always have to rely when war breaks out.

This question, therefore, ought not to be surveyed as if we saw 175,000 men all together in this country as an organized fighting force. But when we come to realize that in this enormous continental domain of ours, to say nothing of the outlying possessions, we must divide this military force up into little dribbles and station those small parts for service here and there at the posts throughout the country and in our outlying possessions; and when we realize we must still further divide up the men for service at schools and colleges for Reserve Officers' Training Corps purposes and with the National Guard in various State organizations, we will soon find we have almost nothing left of any kind of tactical organization that will give the Army itself, its officers, and noncommissioned officers a sufficient force for training from year to year that will make it proficient in military science and prepare for any emergency there might be.

So it was the design in the Army reorganization act that we should be able after distributing the Army about this country, as we are obliged to do, to keep somewhere together a war-time fighting unit of the highest character, both in numbers and in armament, and in all the personnel that are necessary for a war-time fighting unit, so that our officers and noncommissioned officers might in their turn from year to year pass through the administration of and service with a unit of this kind and number and gain experience in the course of their own training in handling a fighting force that could be used in emergency.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman explain what the Senate has provided for—that is, the number of enlisted men—and what would be provided for under the \$72,000,000, or just what is presented to the House upon the amendment in question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It has always proved to be a fact that these rough or round number estimates or figures set out in appropriation bills will not figure out precisely to the unit of men that they are expected to appropriate for, but, roughly speaking, the House conferees stand for 150,000 men, and the Senate proposes to stand for 175,000. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is in accordance with the recommendation of Gen. Pershing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY].

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a statement of The Adjutant General showing the disintegration of the Army from now until May 31, 1922.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the table indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the next and very able Secretary of War, the Hon. John W. Weeks, of Massachusetts, within 10 days advocated the total strength of the Army in enlisted men at 175,000. I am sure that you gentlemen on this side are in harmony with the next Secretary of War, and those on the other side do not desire to embarrass the next administration by having a deficiency reported in providing for only 150,000 men. The present Secretary of War by an order issued about February 1 immediately stopped the enlistment of men. At that time there were enlisted in the Army 237,000. Since that time we have disintegrated proportionately about 8,000 per month gross less 2,000 who have enlisted again, it being allowable for 1-year and 3-year enlistment men as they go out to reenlist, so there is a net disintegration per month of about 6,000 men. Brig. Gen. Herbert M. Lord, of the Finance Department, about two weeks ago testified before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that the average size

of the Army for this year will be 181,000 men. I do not think we ought to appropriate for an Army of 150,000 men when the average Army for this year and into the next fiscal year will be nearly 200,000 men. This table which I insert in the RECORD shows that on November 30, 1921, the total strength of the Army will be about 175,000 men, as fast as they can unenlist them.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLNEY. I have only five minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Gen. Lord, in making that statement, had not taken into consideration the legislation carried by this bill which directs the Secretary of War to discharge from the Army all enlisted men under 18 years of age?

Mr. OLNEY. I understand from The Adjutant General as fast as they can unenlist these men they can not expect to discharge from the Army from natural and other causes more than 6,000 men, including those that make up the strength of the Army up to May 31, 1922, and as fast as those men can be unenlisted, if I may coin the word, the strength of the Army at that time will be about 165,000, not including the Philippine Scouts which amount to nearly 10,000 men. Therefore it seems to me the part of unwisdom to appropriate for an Army of 150,000 men when now at present day figures we have an enlisted strength of about 230,000 men. We can not unenlist them up until the 1st of January next year so that the Army will be less than 175,000 men.

There is another item running along in this bill a little later proposing to promote two great generals to the rank of lieutenant general, and I hope somebody will offer a further amendment here to promote Gen. Crowder as well to hold the rank of lieutenant general. There is another man from Ohio who was in command of the Third Army over in France, Gen. Dickman, who ought to be recognized. The amendment in the Senate concerns Gen. Liggett, a Pennsylvanian by birth, who was in command of the First Army, and Gen. Bullard, of Alabama, in command of the Second Army.

These three armies were thoroughly and efficiently organized over in France, and I would like to see these three great generals promoted. I might suggest that as a modification, as I understand the Senate amendment proposes to promote these two generals to the rank of lieutenant general in the active service, the House might see to it and might vote that these two men, Dickman and Crowder, along with Liggett and Bullard, also be put on the retired list as lieutenant generals, with all that goes with it.

For the information of the House, and most of you are familiar with these facts, I may say that Gen. Liggett retires from the Army March 28, this year. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. OLNEY. The statement that I referred to is as follows:

Projected strength of the U. S. Army, by arm of service, based upon losses by E. T. S. and other normal causes, Feb. 19, 1921.

	Inf.	Tank.	Cav.	F. A.	C. A. C.	A. S.	C. E.	Sig.	J. A. G. D.	Q. M. C.	F. D.	M. D.	O. D.	C. W. S.	D. E. M. L.	Total.	P. S.	Total.
Strength:																		
Jan. 31, 1921.....	83,340	2,700	19,584	27,389	25,193	11,521	7,278	5,081	4	21,162	320	14,385	4,033	533	7,428	230,976	6,884	237,860
Feb. 28, 1921.....	83,770	2,666	19,351	27,142	25,290	11,661	7,145	5,013	4	20,890	322	14,319	4,025	294	7,390	230,283	6,783	237,066
Mar. 31, 1921.....	82,550	2,631	19,096	24,723	25,930	11,482	6,593	4,946	4	20,451	313	14,116	3,971	283	7,284	224,389	6,702	231,091
Apr. 30, 1921.....	81,893	2,597	18,846	23,094	25,222	11,127	6,132	4,877	4	19,995	314	13,925	3,785	280	7,183	218,783	6,616	225,400
May 31, 1921.....	80,003	2,377	18,510	21,893	24,022	10,741	5,918	4,805	4	19,602	310	13,674	3,611	272	7,078	212,519	6,331	219,350
June 30, 1921.....	78,042	2,265	17,367	21,405	23,075	10,590	5,788	4,693	4	19,209	305	13,210	3,478	264	6,954	205,500	6,447	212,946
July 31, 1921.....	75,942	2,091	15,944	20,735	21,947	10,128	5,607	4,550	4	18,914	301	12,710	3,355	261	6,823	199,300	6,364	205,663
Aug. 31, 1921.....	73,570	1,921	14,898	19,849	20,788	9,600	5,439	4,414	4	18,664	297	12,219	3,223	258	6,685	192,127	6,276	198,403
Sept. 30, 1921.....	71,457	1,800	14,634	18,976	19,843	9,685	5,251	4,270	4	18,408	292	11,847	3,116	255	6,534	185,415	6,189	191,604
Oct. 31, 1921.....	69,266	1,764	14,417	17,928	18,968	9,490	5,083	4,153	4	18,144	288	11,483	3,032	252	6,402	183,701	6,103	189,804
Nov. 30, 1921.....	66,185	1,744	14,224	16,528	18,134	9,250	4,740	4,120	4	17,885	282	11,053	2,931	249	6,249	173,593	6,053	179,646
Loss, E. T. S., December, 1921.....	2,873			1,771	508	293	417	3		48	2	458	61		94	6,941		6,941
Loss, other causes (1.252 per cent).....	829	22	178	207	227	116	59	52		224	4	138	37	3	78	2,174	78	2,252
Reenlistments (20.1 per cent).....	577		2	356	182	58	84	1		10		94	12		19	1,395		1,395
Strength, Dec. 31, 1921.....	63,060	1,722	14,040	14,903	17,183	8,902	4,348	4,075	4	17,623	276	10,544	2,848	245	6,093	165,873	5,952	171,825
Need to enlist, December.....				1,235	318	222	493			57		102			2,429	793		3,175
Total December, 1921.....	63,060	1,722	14,040	16,141	17,501	9,124	4,843	4,075	4	17,623	333	10,544	2,848	348	6,093	168,302	6,698	175,000
Loss, E. T. S., January, 1922.....	3,329	1	1	1,531	854	473	249	9		23	9	302	53	1	97	7,132	1	7,133
Loss, other causes (1.245 per cent).....	786	21	175	201	218	114	60	51		220	4	131	35	4	76	2,093	9	2,105
Reenlistments (20.4 per cent).....	720			312	174	96	51	2		5	2	62	11		20	1,455		1,455
Total, January, 1922.....	59,465	1,700	13,864	14,721	16,603	8,633	4,583	4,017	4	17,385	322	10,173	2,771	343	5,943	160,529	6,688	167,217
Need to enlist, January.....	443	16		2,984	1,012	638	1,083			109		23		195	6,405	1,378		7,783
Strength, Jan. 31, 1922.....	59,908	1,716	13,864	17,655	17,615	9,271	5,620	4,017	4	17,385	431	10,173	2,794	538	5,943	166,931	8,066	175,000
Loss, E. T. S., February, 1922.....	1,389	1	25	565	440	258	105	6		25	5	131	40	24	55	3,037		3,037
Loss, other causes (1.243 per cent).....	745	21	172	219	219	115	52	49		216	5	123	35	7	74	2,085	104	2,189
Reenlistments (20.4 per cent).....	283		5	115	60	52	21	1		5	1	27	8		5	1,624		1,624
Total, February, 1922.....	58,067	1,694	13,672	16,989	17,045	8,952	5,454	3,903	4	17,149	422	9,943	2,727	512	5,825	162,405	7,962	170,367
Need to enlist, February.....	810	14		1,385	593	371	709			46		28		83	19	4,058	574	4,632
Strength, Feb. 28, 1922.....	58,867	1,708	13,672	18,371	17,639	9,323	6,163	3,903	4	17,149	468	9,943	2,755	595	5,844	166,404	8,536	175,000
Loss, E. T. S., March, 1922.....	592	1	479	84	164	39	20	20		189		131	11		80	1,818		1,818
Loss, other causes (1.21 per cent).....	730	21	170	228	219	116	76	49		213	6	123	31	7	72	2,061	110	2,171
Reenlistments (21 per cent).....	124		101	18	34	8	6	4		40		28	2		17	382		382
Total, March, 1922.....	57,669	1,686	13,124	18,077	17,290	9,176	6,065	3,898	4	16,787	462	9,717	2,712	588	5,709	162,964	8,423	171,387
Need to enlist, March.....	945	18		1,005	506	283	251			35		85		56	58	3,195	415	3,610
Strength, Mar. 31, 1922.....	58,614	1,704	13,124	19,082	17,796	9,460	6,316	3,898	4	16,787	497	9,717	2,747	644	5,767	165,159	8,841	175,000
Loss, E. T. S., April, 1922.....	3,858	13	2,473	592	574	200	284	60		702		563	65		483	9,933		9,933
Loss, other causes (1.24 per cent).....	727	21	163	237	221	117	78	48		208	6	120	34	8	72	2,060	114	2,174
Reenlistments (10.9 per cent).....	421	1	270	65	63	28	31	8		77		61	7		53	1,085		1,085
Total, April, 1922.....	54,450	1,671	10,758	18,318	17,084	9,113	5,985	3,789	4	15,951	491	9,095	2,635	633	5,285	155,248	8,727	163,975
Need to enlist, April.....	4,190	44	1,224	1,874	1,191	628	573			55		77		111	77	4,037	623	4,660
Strength, Apr. 30, 1922.....	58,640	1,715	11,982	20,192	18,255	9,741	6,558	3,789	4	15,951	546	8,095	2,763	713	5,695	165,645	9,355	175,000
Loss, E. T. S., May, 1922.....	3,881	7	1,324	592	829	286	263	113		1,231		597	71		443	10,217		10,217
Loss, other causes (1.24 per cent).....	727	21	140	230	226	121	61	47		198	7	113	34	9	71	2,054	121	2,175
Reenlistments (11.1 per cent).....	431	1	147	66	92	29	29	13		137		66	8		49	1,135		1,135
Total, May, 1922.....	54,463	1,688	10,853	19,416	17,292	8,800	6,243	3,042	4	14,662	539	8,451	2,669	704	5,230	154,609	9,234	163,843
Need to enlist, May.....	4,739	45	1,475	1,250	1,199	923	428			23		230	112	34	518	10,942	815	11,757
Strength, May 31, 1922.....	59,202	1,733	12,181	20,666	18,451	9,773	6,671	3,642	4	14,662	562	8,687	2,781	738	5,748	165,451	9,549	175,000

NOTE.—No account taken of changes in labor conditions in determining reenlistments. After Nov. 30, number to be enlisted to bring Army up to 175,000 is apportioned among those branches that are below strength. Percentages used in the above calculation are based on the experience during the past year.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] will not be adopted, and yet I do not know that the gentleman from Vermont and I differ very greatly in our views with regard to what should ultimately be done.

The amount carried in the bill as it passed the House would pay an Army of an enlisted strength of approximately 150,000. But the gentlemen in the Senate insist it will not be possible to bring the Army to an enlisted strength of 150,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year for which we appropriate, except by discharges over and above the ordinary and normal reductions, and that therefore our appropriations, taking the Army at the strength they assume it would be at the beginning of the fiscal year, would not provide for an Army maintained at 150,000 during the entire year. They say that in order to pay the Army that would be in service at the beginning of the fiscal year and cover the entire expenditure for pay with the appropriation we have made, it would be necessary to allow the Army to dwindle or to be reduced to a strength about 125,000 or 126,000 at the end of the fiscal year. The conferees know very much better than I do how much there may be in the contention of the Senate. The Senate amendment proposing \$83,000,000 in lieu of \$72,000,000 is based on what they assume will be the enlisted strength of the Army at the beginning of the fiscal year, taking into consideration ordinary and normal reductions in strength up to that time, and then for an Army which would have an enlisted strength of about 162,000 at the end of the fiscal year. It appears, therefore, that neither of the sums carried here provide for an Army of just the numbers that have been so frequently referred to—150,000 in one case and 175,000 in the other—for the entire period.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the gentleman is quite correct. As I reflect upon it, I think I should have said it was in the neighborhood of 162,000 for the average. I stated it a little high.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, if the House adheres to this provision for \$72,000,000, this matter will again be taken up in conference, and if the gentlemen of the Senate can convince our conferees that in order to provide for an Army which shall not go materially below 150,000 for the year that it is necessary to somewhat increase our appropriation, I think it would be their duty to agree with it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As I understand, the 150,000 is 150,000 enlisted men, and then you provide for 14,000 officers in addition to that, do you not?

Mr. MONDELL. The item we are discussing is the item for the pay of the enlisted men and has nothing to do with the pay of the officers.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is, 150,000 enlisted men?

Mr. MONDELL. One hundred and fifty thousand enlisted men.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does the gentleman advocate discharging men who have contracts and who do not want to be discharged?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I do not know as it is necessary for me to pass on that or to express an opinion. I think there are many men who would like to be discharged, but whom the War Department are now holding. My own view is that if the War Department could and would allow men to leave the service who desire to leave it, the probability is the Army would be reduced to close to 150,000 at the beginning of the fiscal year. But I realize that in some cases it may be inexpedient for the department to allow all the men to leave the service who desire to do so, because of the fact that they may be in a branch of the service where the enlisted strength is already low or they may be men who are needed for some special work. So I realize there are some cases where a man's desire for discharge might not in the interest of the service properly be met for a few months. In that state of affairs it is possible that it would not be practicable to reduce the Army to 150,000 men at the beginning of the fiscal year. Of course, I am saying all this realizing that I am not so well informed on the subject as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. I simply want at this time to call to the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming, in connection with what he has been saying, that the next amendment to come up, No. 22, gives express authority to the Secretary of War in his discretion to grant applications for discharge, and that gives him full opportunity along the line the gentleman has stated.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope I have made it reasonably clear that in all probability the conferees will be able to reach an agreement on this item without materially increasing the appropriation carried in the House bill. But it is altogether possible that after going over the matter again with the Senate conferees the House conferees may find that in order to maintain the establishment at the size which the House approves it will be necessary to agree to something of an increase in this item.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. PADGETT. I saw a newspaper report the other day—I do not know whether it is accurate or not—that the appropriation carried in the bill as it passed the House was only sufficient for something like 125,000 or 130,000.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman heard my statement a moment ago, he will recall that I said it was claimed that with the Army at the enlisted strength it is expected to have at the beginning of the fiscal year it would be necessary to reduce the Army to 150,000 in order to pay the enlisted men with the sum appropriated by the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not hear that statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Just how accurate that is I do not know. But it is because there is something in the contention that the conferees should be allowed to go back with this item and make such a compromise as will carry out the views of the House as to the average strength of 150,000 men during the entire year. Mr. LINTHICUM. One other question. As to the average of 150,000 men, I wanted to know whether with the present turn of events in Europe the gentleman thinks we ought to have any increase?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. The conferees on the part of the House feel that it will be possible to arrive at some satisfactory agreement with the Senate on this item. Under the appropriation made by the House, unquestionably in order to maintain the Army at an average of 150,000 men, as the House desires during the next fiscal year, we shall have to arbitrarily discharge 30,000 or 40,000 men between now and July 1. It can be done, and there would not be the slightest necessity of permitting the Army to go down to the minimum of 122,000, as some people have contended. And under any circumstances it would be entirely possible and feasible, with the language that we incorporate in the bill later on, which the House will pass upon, to bring the Army down to about the size that the House desires.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has that ever been done in the history of our country before?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; the necessity never arose.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You realize that you are breaking a contract with the enlisted men?

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman is in error about the contract business. The enlisted man signs no contract with the Government.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There is an implied contract there, and the man has arranged to stay in the Army for three years.

Mr. ANTHONY. We are going to permit them to go back to civil life, where many of them would like to go.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. You are not only going to permit it, but you are going to make them retire to civil life.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. If the House votes down the preferential motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] and votes favorably on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the question is whether the conferees will take that as the position of the House, from which they are not justified in receding?

Mr. ANTHONY. No. The conferees are going to try to arrive at some reasonable compromise in this matter with the Senate—a compromise which will do the least possible damage to the Army and yet at the same time bring the Army down to a reasonable size.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield to me three minutes?
Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. CRAGO. I want it to be possible for the conferees, when it is shown that the reduction of the Army to 150,000 men is a reduction that is too drastic, in order that the Army might properly function to feel that they might, under a proper showing and when the figures are given, agree to the Senate amendment. I do not believe our people at this time want any great standing Army, but we must realize that until the National Guard of the country is thoroughly organized and equipped we have very little defense in this country. That reorganization is slower than we had thought it would be. After every great war in which we have engaged the military history of our country shows that we have foolishly thrown away much of the knowledge and the experience that we gained in these conflicts in which we have been engaged, and I do hope that growing out of this war there will remain with us for years and years to come the realization that it is very necessary for us to have a proper-sized Army in order that that Army may properly function. In other words, you can keep your force down to such a small body of men that it is not possible for our officers, especially of the higher grades, to properly perform their duties and to organize an Army as it should be organized in order to properly function.

I want to call attention to the fact that Gen. Pershing himself and the men who have studied this problem are of the opinion that it is not possible for them to have the Army function as they organized it in France and as they have now organized it with less than about 175,000 men. I would want these conferees to feel that if they so believe the House will back them up in agreeing to an appropriation large enough to provide such an Army.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. In view of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] has said, let me express the opinion that the House will not back up the conferees if they yield the full amount, or any very considerable portion of the increase made by the Senate. [Applause.] I think the conferees should go back free to make such a compromise as seems proper for them to make to carry out, as nearly as may be, the view of the House as to an establishment that shall not fall below 150,000 and shall approximate that number.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FISH. I think there is one question that has not been brought out at all in this House in considering whether we should have an Army of 150,000 or 175,000. As for myself, I am very undecided how to vote, and I think the gentleman might explain to the House what is the size of our present National Guard. As I understand it, we have a Federalized National Guard of some 75,000, and it is expected that we will have a force of 125,000 federalized National Guard by next year. If that is a fact, and believing as I do that these Federalized National Guard soldiers and officers who have seen service are equal in every respect to our Regular Army, I shall vote for 150,000.

Can the gentleman explain to the House the present numerical status of the guard?

Mr. ANTHONY. The present size of the National Guard is approximately 85,000 men. It is growing rapidly, and with the encouragement that we are providing in the increased appropriations in this bill I have not the slightest doubt but that it will reach 125,000 in the early part of the next fiscal year, and it ought to grow to a much larger size.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield to me two minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. FISH. I would like to point out to the House that the Regular Army officers who have investigated the artillery units of the National Guard which have been federalized state that they are in every way equal, if not superior, to the Regular Army Artillery units, for the reason that the vast majority of the "noncoms" and officers who were in the war and served in the Artillery have come back to the National Guard. The same in lesser degree applies to the Infantry units. The "noncoms" and the officers who served in the Infantry outfits on the other side have come back into those Infantry outfits. The soldiers are new, but the instructors and "noncoms" and officers have had actual battle practice. For that reason we should remember that we have a federalized National Guard of

85,000, in every way comparable to our Regular Army, and for that reason I shall vote for an Army of 150,000 Regulars.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Are the Senate conferees insisting on 175,000 men exclusive or inclusive of the Philippine Scouts and the flying cadets?

Mr. ANTHONY. Exclusive.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. How many are there in the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. ANTHONY. Six thousand five hundred.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. How many are provided for in the flying cadets?

Mr. ANTHONY. We provide for about 1,200. I do not know how many there are now, but not nearly that number.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I hope the gentleman will wait until after 2 o'clock. I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects. The question is on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 19, yeas 96.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to get a record vote, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seven members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] will, as their names are called, vote "yea," those opposed "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 82, yeas 242, answered "present" 1, not voting 103, as follows:

YEAS—82.

Ackerman	Hadley	Merritt	Sanders, N. Y.
Bee	Hicks	Miller	Schall
Bland, Mo.	Houghton	Minahan, N. J.	Sims
Burdick	Husted	Monahan, Wis.	Smith, Idaho
Campbell, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moores, Ind.	Smith, N. Y.
Carew	Johnson, Wash.	Morin	Snell
Chindblom	Jones, Pa.	Mott	Snyder
Coady	Kahn	Mudd	Stiness
Copley	Kiess	Newton, Minn.	Tague
Crago	Lea, Calif.	Olney	Temple
Cullen	Lee, Ga.	Osborne	Tilson
Dale	Lehlbach	Paige	Treadway
Dallinger	Lufkin	Parker	Vaile
Dupré	McAndrews	Pell	Walsh
Eagan	McArthur	Phelan	Waiters
Elliott	McGlennon	Pou	Welling
Fisher	McKiniry	Raker	White, Me.
Glynn	McKinley	Rhodes	Winslow
Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rogers	Zihlman
Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Rowe	
Greene, Vt.	Mar'in	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—242.

Almon	Burroughs	Echols	Hernandez
Anderson	Butler	Edmonds	Hersey
Andrews, Md.	Byrnes, S. C.	Esch	Hickey
Andrews, Nebr.	Byrns, Tenn.	Evans, Mont.	Hill
Anthony	Campbell, Kans.	Evans, Nebr.	Hoch
Ashbrook	Candler	Fairfield	Hoyer
Cannon	Cann	Farr	Huddleston
Cantrill	Carr	Fess	Hudspeth
Ayres	Caraway	Fields	Hull, Iowa
Babka	Carss	Fish	Hull, Tenn.
Bacharach	Carter	Flood	Humphreys
Bankhead	Christopherson	Focht	Hutchinson
Barbour	Cleary	Fordney	Igoe
Barkley	Collier	Foster	Ireland
Begg	Connally	Frear	Jacoway
Bell	Cooper	Freeman	James, Va.
Benham	Cramton	French	Jeffers
Benson	Currie, Mich.	Fuller	Johnson, Ky.
Black	Curry, Calif.	Gallivan	Johnson, Miss.
Bland, Ind.	Darrow	Ganly	Jones, Tex.
Bland, Va.	Davey	Gard	Kearns
Blanton	Davis, Minn.	Garrett	Keller
Boies	Davis, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Kelley, Mich.
Bowers	Dempsey	Good	Kelly, Pa.
Bowling	Denison	Goodall	Kendall
Box	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz	Kennedy, Iowa
Brand	Dickinson, Mo.	Greene, Iowa	Kincheloe
Briggs	Dominick	Greene, Mass.	King
Brinson	Dowell	Griest	Kinkaid
Brooks, Ill.	Dunbar	Hardy, Colo.	Kleccka
Brooks, Pa.	Dunn	Haugen	Knutson
Browne	Dyer	Hawley	Kraus
Buchanan			

Krcider	Newton, Mo.	Rouse	Tillman
Lampert	Nolan	Rucker	Timberlake
Lanham	Ogden	Sabath	Tischer
Lankford	Oldfield	Scott	Vinson
Layton	Oliver	Sells	Voigt
Lazaro	Padgett	Shreve	Volk
Linthicum	Park	Siegel	Volstead
Little	Parrish	Sinclair	Ward
Luce	Patterson	Sinnott	Wason
Luhning	Peters	Sisson	Watson
McDuffie	Porter	Smith, Ill.	Weaver
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Purnell	Smithwick	Webster
McLeod	Quin	Steagall	Welty
McPherson	Radcliffe	Stedman	Whaley
MacGregor	Rainey, Ala.	Stephens, Miss.	Wheeler
Madden	Rainey, Henry T.	Stephens, Ohio	White, Kans.
Magee	Ramsey	Stevenson	Williams
Mann, Ill.	Ramseyer	Stoll	Wilson, Ill.
Mansfield	Randall, Calif.	Strong, Kans.	Wilson, La.
Mays	Randall, Wis.	Strong, Pa.	Wilson, Pa.
Michener	Ransley	Summers, Wash.	Wingo
Milligan	Rayburn	Summers, Tex.	Wood, Ind.
Mondell	Reber	Sweet	Woods, Va.
Moore, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	Swindall	Woodyard
Moore, Va.	Ricketts	Swope	Yates
Murphy	Robinson, N. C.	Taylor, Ark.	Young, N. Dak.
Neely	Robison, Ky.	Taylor, Colo.	Young, Tex.
Nelson, Mo.	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.	
Nelson, Wis.	Rose	Thompson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Crowther

NOT VOTING—103.

Baer	Gallagher	Larsen	Riordan
Britten	Gandy	Lesher	Rodenberg
Brumbaugh	Garner	Loneragan	Rowan
Burke	Goldfogle	Longworth	Rubey
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McClintic	Sanders, La.
Casey	Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Sanford
Clark, Fla.	Griffin	McFadden	Scully
Clark, Mo.	Hamill	McKenzie	Sears
Classon	Hamilton	McKeown	Sherwood
Cole	Hardy, Tex.	Maher	Slemp
Costello	Harrell	Major	Small
Crisp	Harrison	Mann, S. C.	Smith, Mich.
Dent	Hastings	Mason	Steele
Dewalt	Hayden	Mead	Steenerson
Donovan	Hays	Montague	Sullivan
Dooling	Hersman	Moon	Thomas
Doremus	Holland	Mooney	Tinkham
Doughton	Howard	Nicholls	Towner
Drane	Hulings	O'Connell	Upshaw
Drewry	James, Mich.	O'Connor	Vare
Eagle	Johnston, N.Y.	Overstreet	Venable
Ellsworth	Juul	Perlman	Vestal
Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, John W.	Watkins
Emerson	Kettner	Reavis	Wise
Evans, Nev.	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	Wright
Ferris	Langley	Riddick	

So the motion to recede and concur was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. CROWTHER (for) with Mr. UPSHAW (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. CRISP.

Mr. JUUL with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. LARSEN.

Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. OVERSTREET.

Mr. BENHAM with Mr. MCKEOWN.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. VESTAL with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. MEAD.

Mr. HAYS with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. MASON with Mr. MAJOR.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. VARE with Mr. WISE.

Mr. CLASSON with Mr. JOHN W. RAINY.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. BAER with Mr. MOON.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. DREWRY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. DENT.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. COLE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. GARNER.

Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. HARDY of Texas.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. SEARS.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. RIOEDAN.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. SULLIVAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to insist.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 22: On page 17, line 11, after the word "guardian," insert "and the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men who have served one year or more with records satisfactory to their commanding officers, without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and shall also furnish to each transportation in kind from the place of discharge to the railroad station at or nearest to the place of acceptance for enlistment, or to his home if the distance thereto is no greater than from the place of discharge to the place of acceptance for enlistment, but if the distance be greater he may be furnished with transportation in kind for a distance equal to that from place of discharge to place of acceptance for enlistment; and the Secretary of War is authorized, in his discretion, to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges."

Mr. ANTHONY. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, perfects the language of the bill so as to carry out the ideas of the House in regard to the discharge of boys under 18 who enlisted in the Army. It provides that they shall be given a discharge after enlistment. It waives any infraction of military regulations that they have been guilty of in making a false enlistment and permits a discharge based on the conduct after enlistment—an honorable discharge if they have been good soldiers, and otherwise not. It gives them transportation to the place of enlistment or to their homes if it is not farther than the place of enlistment.

The Senate has added this language:

The Secretary of War is authorized, in his discretion, to grant applications, where discharged, to enlisted men, without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges.

Mr. FIELDS. That does not apply to men under 18 years of age; it applies to the whole Army.

Mr. ANTHONY. It applies to the whole Army.

Mr. FIELDS. I understand the amendment in relation to the transportation applies to residence not a greater distance from the place where the soldier is discharged than the place where he was enlisted; the transportation will be given equivalent to the transportation to the place of enlistment.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct. If he has changed his residence, he will be given transportation equivalent to the place of enlistment.

Mr. FIELDS. If he was not enlisted at home and the residence is farther away than the place of enlistment, he will be given transportation equivalent to the place of enlistment.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman spoke of enlistment after one year. Suppose they have enlisted for less than one year, what about getting a discharge then? There may be a number of cases where they enlisted for less than a year.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have cut that language out. The language "who have served one year or more with a record satisfactory to the commanding officer" is eliminated. Any boy under 18 can get a discharge the day after.

Mr. PADGETT. If one is over 18 and wants to get out, then he has to have a year's service?

Mr. ANTHONY. We grant this authority to the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to grant a discharge.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We had a long debate in the House when the bill was originally before us and it was demonstrated then that there was a disposition on the part of some Members to claim that where a minor had enlisted in the Army and then found it did not come up to his expectations or that of the family, his parents could claim the right to a discharge because he was a minor, and that this youth ought not to be discharged under any handicap, that he should be put on the status of a full-grown man who had voluntarily enlisted

in the Army, served faithfully and well with fidelity, and completed his contract, and should receive an honorable discharge and traveling allowance back to the place of original enlistment. Does this amendment propose to do anything of that kind?

Mr. ANTHONY. It does not; it waives any infringement of the military discipline which he may have been guilty of. It takes his conduct after enlistment, and if it is good he gets an honorable discharge, and if it is bad he can not get the same kind of a discharge.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. This is what I am trying to get at. There is no use of blinking the situation out of sight. If we are going to make the way plain for a man who is disposed to bellyache and welsh, to get all the honors and emoluments of a man who stood up to the gaff—

Mr. ANTHONY. We treat the boy as a minor and we give the authority for his discharge entirely to his parents or guardian.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Let me suggest this practical proposition: Here is a boy 17 years of age, one year under the limit you set. He has been reading novels like Dick Deadeye and other literature, and he wants to take a trip around the world in the Army. He enlists and expects to be sent to the Philippines, and does not get any farther than San Francisco or Hawaii when he gets homesick and finds that if he is in the Army as a soldier he must be a man, do a man's work, and take his share with the rest. But he begins to bellyache and welsh, and writes home to his mother to take advantage of her parental authority to get him out of the Army. He has been to the Philippines; he has had a fine Cook's tour at the expense of the Government; he is returned in a gold chariot back to the place where he ran away from home—

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me say that the Army recruiting officer will take great care not to enlist any boys under 18.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In the meantime you are punishing your Army by erecting a false standard in order that you may safeguard a policy of some chance recruiting officer, and it seems to me that we are getting at the wrong end—you should start him so that he will render the absolute Spartan service that every soldier owes, to do his duty faithfully and well until he is honorably discharged.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, this amendment, I think, removes the objections complained of by some Members of the House when the proposition passed here, and some undesirable features in the Senate amendment. As the provision passed the House the Secretary of War had no discretion in the discharge of these men. He was directed by that provision to honorably discharge all men under 18 years of age regardless of their service record. I did not agree with that and I did not think that was the proper thing at the time. The Senate amended the bill by striking out the word "honorably" which made it impossible for the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to a man under 18 years of age, regardless of how good his services had been. The Senate further amended the proposition by providing for transportation in kind to the railroad station nearest the place of enlistment. With that I could not agree. For instance, a boy may have lived in Virginia and enlisted in New York and be stationed at the time of his discharge at Fort Myer. It would be unnecessary to send him back to New York, the place of enlistment. The conferees, therefore, provided that he shall be furnished with transportation in kind to the place of his residence or there shall be applied to that whatever the cost would be back to the place of enlistment. The conferees have provided for a discharge in accordance with the record the soldier had made while in the service.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. In amendment 22 it is provided that the Secretary may grant applications for discharge to enlisted men who have served one year, but it says nothing about honorable discharge.

Mr. FIELDS. That does not apply to the question that we are discussing.

Mr. VAILE. It applies to those over 18 years of age as well as under.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Amendment 19 applies to those under 18 years of age.

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. And in neither place is there any provision for an honorable discharge. The boy may not have been a welsher; he may have served faithfully and honestly, but he goes out with a discharge that is not an honorable discharge and consequently is a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. FIELDS. The language in the amendment now pending provides for a discharge upon his service record.

Mr. VAILE. But it does not provide for an honorable discharge.

Mr. FIELDS. I think it could not be construed in any other way. I have not the language before me, but from my study of it I believe that if he has had honorable service it is incumbent upon the Secretary of War to give him an honorable discharge.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman knows as a matter of fact that in the popular mind there are but two kinds of discharges, an honorable one and a dishonorable one.

Mr. FIELDS. That is true.

Mr. VAILE. If he merely gets a discharge and does not get an honorable discharge, what he gets as a matter of fact is a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. FIELDS. The language of the amendment provides that he shall be discharged upon his service record; and if he has a record of honorable service, then it follows that the discharge must be an honorable discharge.

Mr. VAILE. It perhaps does not make so much difference in time of peace, but in time of war it makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. FIELDS. This is peace-time legislation. I doubt if the gentleman has studied the language of the amendment. Of course, the language which he has before him in the bill is not the language we are considering. The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, I think, meets all of the objections on both sides except the objections of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], and I want now to discuss his objection for a few minutes. If recruiting officers did not become overzealous, if they did not mislead these boys of 15 and 16 years of age, there might be some basis for the argument of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], but I know, as every Member of this House knows who has tried to ascertain the facts, that recruiting officers resort to any and every method to get these boys into the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FIELDS. I asked a boy a few days ago why he made the statement that he was 18 years of age when he was only 16. He said that he told the recruiting officer he was only 16, and the recruiting officer then said to him, "Oh, well, you want to get into the Army; this is only a matter of form, and I shall put it in here that you are 18 years of age," and he put it in, and the boy signed the application. I hope after the Army is required to discharge boys under 18 years of age that the War Department will at least instruct its recruiting officers in the future to be more careful about the enlistment of boys under 18 years of age.

One other word with regard to the amendment. The amendment does not leave it optional with the boy as to whether or not he shall be discharged. It leaves it to his parents or guardian. The boy can not be discharged upon his own application. The application must be made by the parent or by the legal guardian, and I think that is correct.

As I said a moment ago, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, which is the language agreed upon by the conferees, removes all of the substantial objections in either branch of Congress. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 23: Page 17, line 17, insert: "That nothing contained in Public Resolution No. 59 of the Sixty-sixth Congress shall be held to prohibit sufficient enlistments in any branch of the Army to bring such branch to not more than 60 per cent of the number prescribed therefor in the act entitled 'An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice,' approved June 4, 1920, nor to prohibit the enlistment in addition thereto of flying cadets to the number now authorized by law."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 23, and that the managers on the part of the House be given authority to agree upon said amendment. I do this for the reason that the percentage named in the amendment will be entirely dependent upon the size that is agreed upon for the Army.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House further insist upon its dis-

agreement to the Senate amendment, and that the conferees be given authority to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 23, line 6, after the word "fund" insert: "Provided, That so much of the unexpended amount of the appropriation for pay, etc., of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 as may be necessary to permit payment for the adjustment and settlement of claims of officers, members of the Nurse Corps, and enlisted men for pay and allowances growing out of service in the World War from April 6, 1917, to June 30, 1919, inclusive, shall remain upon the books of the Treasury to the credit of that appropriation until June 30, 1922: *Provided further*, That the Army shall be reduced by the Secretary of War so that the sum herein appropriated shall defray the entire cost of the pay of the enlisted men of the line and staff during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with the following amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12 of the matter inserted by said amendment, before the word "enlisted," insert "officers and."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the first part of this amendment gives authority that so much of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for pay, and so forth, of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 as may be necessary to permit payment for the adjustment and settlement of claims of officers and enlisted men for pay and allowances growing out of service in the World War from April 6, 1917, to June 30, 1919, shall remain upon the books of the Treasury to the credit of that appropriation until June 30, 1922. The reason for that is that there are thousands of these claims, mostly from enlisted men. Perhaps they were short in their pay for one month. They are nearly all small claims, but they are legitimate claims and will have to be paid.

If we do not keep this unexpended balance open on the books of the Treasury they will come back to Congress in the shape of auditor's claims and will have to be taken care of in a deficiency, and this is the simplest way to get around it. The amendment as offered inserts the word "officers" so as to compel the Secretary of War to keep the number of officers as well as the number of men within the appropriations which we provide in the bill. I ask for a vote.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield me two minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I realize that very likely at this stage of the game it will be unwise if not impossible to prevent the conferees having their way about this provision, but I do want to call to the attention of the House in all seriousness that we have entered upon a policy that I think will return to plague us. For many years it has been the well recognized and established policy of this Congress not to determine the maximum of enlisted men in limiting figures in the Army appropriation bill from year to year. That would absolutely prevent the War Department or the Commander in Chief from raising the Army to the number actually provided for as the maximum established by the foundation law in case an emergency demanded it.

Now, the benefit of that policy was as well established through practical experience as any other similar policy could be, and it was this: From time to time international situations provoke some state of irritation or unpleasant feeling between peoples that possibly might drift on toward that state of dispute that would indicate a possible military clash. That is not so much true, of course, with our relations with far distant countries, but we can easily imagine one or two countries near by where that situation might at any time develop. It is very plain from the experience of human nature that if the President, seeing such a situation already on his hands and fearing lest it grow to the point of an emergency that would bring on a clash, should come to Congress and ask authority to raise more troops, that official act would advertise his anxiety over the situation, and there would be more tendency to increase the irritation and gravity of the situation as an implied threat of war if he were to take such action. And so the law has hitherto always provided an ultimate maximum, which as the foundation law it was obliged to do for economic reasons, but never insisting that the War Department should keep absolutely to the limit of the amount appropriated if this unexpected emergency should arise during the year. By that means the President had an opportunity quietly to study his forces and add to the units here and there if he sees the situation develop on our borders that might ultimately lead to war or to some armed engagement. Whereas if he had to wait until Congress was convened, he would not even have made that degree of preparation.

It is a simple matter, never has been abused in any sense relating to these emergencies, and sometimes has been the means of quietly holding troops in preparation for a conflict from whatever source the emergency might afterwards develop.

Mr. LAYTON. Would not the National Guard be available?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The National Guard—the calling out of the National Guard is a threat of war itself.

Mr. LAYTON. But they are ready to be called.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand. It is not the placing of troops in the field in armed array along the border line itself, not at all; it is the quiet recruiting of the Army against an emergency before any publicity has been given to it at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is a matter of policy. The day may come when we shall regret having made this very arbitrary provision in an appropriation bill, particularly in times of such unrest as this.

I only want to call attention to another feature of this proposed amendment on the part of the conferees, and that is that they propose to limit the officers as well as the enlisted men. We often see here a picture of the Regular Army as a tactical force officered under the provisions of law by just the number of commissioned officers as were necessary for such a tactical organization. On the contrary, the relation of the officers of the Army to the enlisted men that we provide from year to year by these bills is not of a tactical ratio at all. We are in the position now of recruiting the commissioned personnel that was provided for by the Army reorganization act. It seems to me it is a great mistake if by reason of the passage of the limitation proposed by this amendment the Secretary of War should not be able to take into the Army within the ensuing fiscal year here and there individual men who are prepared to give themselves up to the military profession as commissioned officers while there are still three or four thousand vacancies. This man, that man, and the other man could not take advantage of his lifetime opportunity to begin his career as a commissioned officer in the Army, especially at a time when we are looking far and wide for a desirable commissioned personnel and find ourselves short of men by thousands. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I agree in the main with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] that this Congress has adopted a very nebulous and uncertain policy in reference to size of the Army. It has already provided that recruiting shall stop. Now it will require, by this limitation, the Secretary of War to reduce the Army to what point? The resolution adopted some time ago provided that enlistments should be discontinued until the Army was reduced to 175,000 men.

In this proviso you direct the Secretary of War to reduce the Army to what point? Why, to the point where the funds appropriated in this bill will pay for the men in the service. It would take a dozen accountants a long time to find out under the provisions of this bill just how many men could be had in the different branches of the service. Recruiting has been stopped, and you have already given the Secretary of War very broad powers with reference to the discharge of men. Why do you not eliminate this provision and let the Secretary of War reduce the force gradually by the elimination by discharge of such men as want to be discharged?

Now, if the conferees go back and agree on an Army of 150,000 men, the Secretary of War would be directed to reduce the Army to 150,000, when a month or more ago you fixed the size of the Army at 175,000. There ought to be some stability of policy in regard to this matter.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is not entirely accurate—

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not yield to an argument, but I will be glad to yield to a question.

Mr. MONDELL. May I suggest to the gentleman we did not fix the size of the Army at 175,000 men, but having appropriated for an Army of 175,000 men, we said to the Secretary of War, "You must not enlist beyond 175,000." We did not fix the strength of the Army. It was calling his attention to the number we had appropriated for.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Wyoming, like he often does, rushes into the House without knowing what has transpired before he gets here, and assumes a lot of things that do not exist. What the "gentleman from Texas" said was that you passed a resolution the other day directing the Sec-

retary of War to discontinue enlistments until the Army was reduced to 175,000 men.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman from Texas said was that we passed a resolution limiting the Army to 175,000 men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did you not?

Mr. MONDELL. We did not.

Mr. CONNALLY. What did you do? The resolution provided that enlistments should stop until the Army was reduced to 175,000 men.

Mr. MONDELL. That was the only logical thing we could do when we had appropriated for an Army of 175,000 men. We could not logically have appropriated for that amount and said to the Secretary of War, "You can not enlist beyond 150,000." That would not have been logical.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman that he admits exactly what I said, namely, that you passed a resolution directing the Secretary of War to stop the enlistments until the Army was reduced to 175,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Until we had provided for the number in the current bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was what was in your mind perhaps. I am talking about legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would like two more minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. CONNALLY. When people come to read statute laws or appropriation bills of this or any other Congress they will read what is on the printed page and not follow the gentleman from Wyoming into his private study and ask what was in his mind at the time he drew the resolution.

Mr. MONDELL. The "gentleman from Wyoming" did not draw the resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. He instructed somebody to draw it, because most legislation that has been enacted in this Congress has been at the behest of the gentleman from Wyoming, and frequently considered with the same haste, and the same lack of judgment, and the same lack of attention to what has already transpired as are evidenced by the gentleman's conduct on this occasion.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman denies the soft impeachment that he draws the legislation. He also differs with the gentleman from Texas as to the character of the legislation he has drawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the gentleman from Wyoming is very skillful in his parliamentary power.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY. Thank you. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas recognizes that I am doing a service to the majority side of this House [laughter] and gives me more time than I asked.

What I started out to say, Mr. Speaker, was that I agree in the main with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], that this Congress ought to adopt some definite policy with reference to the size of the Army. This Republican Congress passed an Army bill authorizing and permitting 280,000 men to be enlisted and then came scurrying back to Washington after election demanding that the Army be reduced to 175,000, and later brought in a resolution providing that enlistments shall be discontinued until the Army reaches not more than 175,000. Then, what do you do? Are you satisfied with that? Now, no doubt, under the instructions of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee brings in an appropriation bill appropriating for only 150,000 men, when you know that there are many more than that in the Army, and when you know that the Secretary of War will understand you to mean what you said when you directed a reduction of the Army to 175,000 men.

Now you present another provision directing the Secretary of War to reduce the Army from 175,000 men, if it has been reduced to that number, to the number which this bill will maintain. What does it mean? It does not mean anything definite. You ought to say it if you mean 150,000. If you mean the Secretary of War should reduce the Army to 150,000 men, why do you not say so? Through such a jugglery of words and language and provisos the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will be enabled about the time of the special session of the Sixty-seventh Congress to rise up in all of his "leader-torial" glory and declaim against one of the executive departments for not reading his mind and interpreting his secret thoughts. To do that members of the Cabinet should be permitted to attend the gentleman's caucus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House with a clearer mind or a better understanding than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] who has just taken his seat. And yet it seems to be necessary occasionally to hold a primary class for his exclusive benefit. [Laughter.] With the permission of the House, I shall conduct for a few moments such a primary class.

Some time since the Congress fixed the maximum of the Army of the United States at 280,000 men in enlisted strength. Later, when the Congress came to appropriate, the Congress appropriated for an Army with an enlisted strength of 175,000 men. When the appropriation bill was presented to the House the statement was made that the appropriations for personnel were in a sum which would pay an Army of 175,000 enlisted men.

The Secretary of War, without authority, I think, certainly not following the will of Congress, saw fit to secure enlistments far in excess of the number which the Congress had appropriated for, and those enlistments had reached a point which was resulting in the constant piling up of a deficiency, and the Congress thereupon adopted a resolution as follows:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed and instructed to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States until the number of enlistments shall not exceed 175,000.

In other words, the Congress said to the Secretary of War, "You have enlisted beyond the number that Congress contemplated. You must cease those enlistments until you reach the number contemplated by the appropriations of Congress."

It was not the fixing of the strength of the Army, except as the strength had been fixed by the appropriation. Even though it might have been true at the time we passed that resolution that we believed that the Army need not be larger than 150,000, it would not have been logical to say to the Secretary, "You must stop enlisting until the Army is 150,000," because we had for the present fiscal year, by our appropriation, provided for an Army of 175,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, may I have three minutes more?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I agree with the gentleman in the main.

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Following that, the Army bill for the coming fiscal year was made up, and the members of the committee having the bill in charge concluded after consultation with Members on both sides that the House now believed that an Army of 150,000 was sufficient for the coming fiscal year, and they brought in a bill with appropriations based on an Army of that size.

That is now the situation. It is perfectly simple; it is perfectly clear to everyone, except that it does not appear to be clear to the usually very intelligent gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Now I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. QUIN. Does this bill now, if we vote down Mr. GREENE's motion, fix it so that they can not go beyond 150,000 men?

Mr. MONDELL. If the appropriation we have made in the House shall be the sum carried in the bill, there will not be enough to pay more than 150,000 men, or authority to pay more than 150,000 men.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will if I have time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman think that the Army ought to be appropriated for at 150,000 or 175,000?

Mr. MONDELL. One hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why did the gentleman sponsor the resolution for 175,000?

Mr. MONDELL. Why, continuing the primer class for the exclusive benefit of the gentleman from Texas, we had at that time appropriated for an Army of 175,000. We could not logically say to the Secretary otherwise than "You must reduce the number of enlisted men to the number we appropriated for."

DEATH OF HON. CHAMP CLARK, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my painful duty to announce to the House the death of one of its most prominent Members. Ex-Speaker CLARK passed away a few moments ago at his hotel in this city.

I talked with his son for a few moments an hour or two ago, and he said that his father's latest conscious expression gave voice to his great anxiety for the legislative success of this Congress. He said he knew his father, if he could be heard, would express the desire that no adjournment be had in consequence of his death.

At a later hour in the day, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer appropriate resolutions, which I trust the House will adopt.

RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, out of our high regard for our departed friend, our sincere sympathy with his family, and in honor of his memory, I ask that the House now stand in recess for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House now stand in recess for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

WIDOW OF HON. CHAMP CLARK.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of House joint resolution 480.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks immediate consideration of House joint resolution 480, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 2, 1921.

House joint resolution 480, making appropriation to pay the widow of CHAMP CLARK.

Resolved, etc., That there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$7,500 to pay to the widow of CHAMP CLARK, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 53: Page 39, line 25, strike out the words beginning in line 25, with "Provided" and ending with the word "act," in line 5 of page 40, and insert: "Provided, That hereafter the settlement of clothing accounts of enlisted men, including charges for clothing drawn in excess of clothing allowance and payments of amounts due them when they draw less than their allowance, shall be made at such periods and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that we recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FESS). The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 54: Page 40, line 11, insert: "The provisions of the act of February 28, 1919, relating to the issuance of uniforms to discharged enlisted men are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That such uniforms shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of said act to those enlisted men who served in the Army of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and January 1, 1920, whose applications therefor shall have been received at the War Department prior to July 1, 1921."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "July" and insert in lieu thereof "April."

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask for a vote.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the idea of making the date April 1?

Mr. ANTHONY. The idea is to close up the matter of unfilled clothing allowances as soon as possible. There are a large number of men who are entitled to articles of clothing, who have not claimed them under the laws passed by Congress giving every man a complete outfit. It is figured that if the Quartermaster Department has to fill all the possible demands under the law it will cost us \$16,000,000 to do it. We fix an early date for the settlement of these accounts so that we can close up the books.

Mr. ANDERSON. You practically establish a statute of limitations, so that nobody can get anything.

Mr. ANTHONY. It means that any man who has slept upon his rights for two years has been to blame, and that Congress has not been to blame.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do not think that men who have failed to claim their allowance from the Government should be charged with having slept upon their rights. There may be very many reasons why this allowance for clothing has not been claimed. There may be men in distant parts of the country who are uninformed with reference to this matter. I want to submit to the gentleman whether a period of three months should not be given to such men who served their country to make their claims? I do not believe a very considerable number of claims will come in during those three months, and it ought not to be said that the Congress quite unceremoniously shut them off with about 25 days' notice.

Mr. ANTHONY. Our information is that most of the men who really needed articles of clothing have claimed them, but there are several hundred thousands who have not claimed them, who are largely men who do not need the clothing, who did not want to bother about it; but if they are informed of the fact that they can claim this clothing and are given a long period of time in which to do it, they may demand it of the Government, and that will require quite a large force of clerks to be kept at work filling these orders and a young department store down in the Quartermaster's Department to do that work. I think there has been so much publicity given to it that every man who really needed clothing has availed himself of the generosity of Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So far there has been no intimation that the right to claim this clothing would terminate at any particular time, but now we are terminating it in less than 30 days.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the gentleman think two years is a pretty liberal time?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; but we have held out to them the expectation that there would be no limit to the time.

Mr. ANTHONY. But good business would demand, I think, that the Government clean this matter up.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That would presume that the Government would engage in good business.

Mr. CROWTHER. What is the basis for the estimate that it will cost \$16,000,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. That estimate is based on the number of men who have so far failed to claim certain articles to which they would be entitled. It is estimated that it will require \$16,000,000 additional appropriations in this bill if they all demand everything to which they are entitled.

Mr. CROWTHER. To provide equipment for such as have the right to demand it?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, was there any such limitation placed upon the soldiers after the Civil War?

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. They did not get anything of this kind.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They received certain allowances for clothing.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think they were given the uniforms with which they left the field.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. That is all.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think they were given complete outfits. This is an unprecedented action on the part of Congress, and in most cases was entirely gratuitous and unnecessary and a willful waste of the public money.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. A great many ex-service men, scattered in remote sections of the country, are unable to get information with reference to their rights. Many of them do not see papers, and I am inclined to think you will work great injustice to many worthy ex-service men if this limitation as to clothing allowance is placed in the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think most of them know about it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Is it not true that there are millions of these various things that belong to these men that are now stored in the great storage warehouses of this Government, and that there is \$16,000,000 worth of olive-drab melton in the Boston warehouse with which to make uniforms? Is there not

plenty of material on hand, so that the cost to the Government will not be so great?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; there is a great shortage of uniforms made up, and we are appropriating money for that purpose in this bill.

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Kansas by striking out the word "April" and inserting the word "June."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CHINDELOM moves to amend the amendment by striking out the word "April" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "June."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fess). The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CHINDELOM) there were—ayes 8, noes 13.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Speaker, I make the preferential motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield to me; I want a little time?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from Alabama five minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that probably the conference committee has been led into a misapprehension as to the existing law on this proposition with reference to the right of soldiers to have uniforms issued to them and their right to wear them. I feel that if the gentleman's attention had been called to the provisions of section 8 of the last annual naval appropriation bill, approved June, 1920, the conferees would have reached a different conclusion on this proposition. This amendment seeks to repeal the act approved February 28, 1919, which was amendatory of the provisions of the national defense act with reference to the wearing of uniforms by men who had been discharged from the service. If the gentleman has before him a copy of the act approved February 28, 1919, he will see—

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman does not contend that we are trying to legislate in reference to the wearing of the uniform.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly what you are doing.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; we seek to repeal so much of the act as relates to the issuing of the uniform.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will take the first section of the act he is repealing, he will see that he can not repeal the portion of the act with reference to the issuance of uniforms without repealing the whole business. The law is so interwoven that if you repeal the part with reference to the issuance of the uniform you destroy and leave incoherent the remainder. If this amendment is adopted—and I think the chairman will agree with me—you are repealing an act which is the only law authorizing the ex-service men to wear uniforms issued to them on their discharge from the service. The naval appropriation bill of 1920 repealed all of this act that you are seeking to repeal, and I introduced at this session, after a conference with the leader of the majority, the gentleman from Wyoming, a resolution to restore the provisions of this very act of February 28, 1919, which would restore to the ex-service men the privilege of wearing a uniform issued by the Government. As a matter of fact, that law is now repealed by the provisions of section 8 of the last naval appropriation bill. I do not see the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee here, but we investigated it and the resolution I introduced had the unanimous approval of the Naval Committee. I thought it proper to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that proposition, because if the law goes into effect as is now presented in this amendment you are subjecting every ex-service man in the country to punishment for wearing a uniform except on strictly ceremonious occasions. In fact, there are ex-service men now under arrest for wearing a uniform which the act of February 28 gave them the right to enjoy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like three minutes more. This is a very important matter and I regret very much that I was absent from the city when the Unanimous Consent Calendar was called up.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was out of town on account of a death in my family when the calendar was called, and that resolution went off upon somebody's objection. I feel sure that if we could have reached that bill on the calendar it would have received practically the unanimous support of every Member of the House, because the resolution introduced restores the status

that these men enjoyed under the provisions of the act you are now seeking to repeal. It seems to me before you write that into law it should have the serious attention of Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the motion to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 70: Page 52, line 11, after the figures "\$3,000,000," insert "to remain available until December 31, 1922."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in this amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 71: Page 63, line 6, after the word "Provided," insert: "That not to exceed \$7,000,000 of the funds heretofore appropriated for inland and port storage and shipping facilities shall be available for obligation on and after July 1, 1921: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriations for inland and port storage and shipping facilities available for the fiscal year 1922 shall be available for the payment of clerical services pertaining to the activities of the Quartermaster Corps in the District of Columbia or elsewhere: *Provided further*."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 84: Page 63, line 18, insert:

"NATIONAL TROPHY AND MEDALS FOR RIFLE CONTESTS.

"For the purpose of furnishing a national trophy and medals and other prizes to be provided and contested for annually, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, said contest to be open to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the National Guard or Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia, members of rifle clubs, and civilians, and for the cost of the trophy, prizes, and medals herein provided for, and for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States, including the reimbursement of necessary expenses of members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, to be expended for the purposes hereinbefore prescribed, under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$10,000."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 104. Page 71, line 21, insert: "That in the Army of the United States the grade of lieutenant general is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said grade two general officers, who, prior to the close of hostilities, especially distinguished themselves in command of field armies in the American Expeditionary Forces; and the officers appointed under the foregoing authorization shall have the pay prescribed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, and such allowances as the President shall deem appropriate: *Provided*, That no more than two appointments to office shall be made under the terms of this paragraph."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, this is the Senate amendment which seeks to create the grade of lieutenant general and appoint two officers of distinguished service to that position in the Regular Establishment. I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the purpose of prescribing the salary that they shall receive by veiling it by a reference to some old law? Why is it not put into the bill so that everyone will understand what he is voting for?

Mr. ANTHONY. Because that old law fixes the pay for the lieutenant general.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of this proposition?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am in favor of the proposition at the proper time, but I do not think it is the proper time in which to pass it now or to include it in this bill. I have moved that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me five minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no difference of opinion either in the House or in the country with regard to the splendid character of the services rendered by the men who would be promoted if this Senate amendment were to be agreed to. I am of the opinion, however, after talking with quite a goodly number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the House is not prepared at this time to pass affirmatively upon this matter. There are many reasons why this is not the time or the place for legislation of this character. This is an appropriation bill. A provision of this kind does not belong on an appropriation bill. There are many questions to be considered in connection with the matter of promoting and recognizing the services of our faithful, gallant, and distinguished leaders in the Great War. I am very much in hopes that without overmuch discussion of the matter at this time, at least without discussion that might disparage the services of anyone, the House will agree to the formal motion which the gentleman from Kansas has made.

I can not say what will occur in case that motion is agreed to, but my opinion is, if the bill be returned to the Senate with the formal motion to disagree to the Senate amendment, that the Senate would yield and the item would go out of the bill, leaving this question and all questions like it and related to it to be determined at a later date. I hope that may be done. We can easily get into a more or less heated and more or less acrimonious discussion of the question involved and of collateral questions, but at the end of it I do not believe the House in its present temper would agree to the promotions suggested or to any amended provision. On the other hand, if the matter is left for settlement and determination at some future time, an agreement can, I believe, be reached that will fully recognize and do justice and honor to the distinguished services rendered by the gallant commanders of our armies overseas.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say only this. I am not going to vote to give another single extra nickel or to confer another single honor upon any man in the Army, which brought victory back home from France, until something is done for the private soldier who fought in the trenches. That is all I have to say.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO].

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that has been said along the line that this is not the proper place for this legislation, but in my opinion it is the only place where we can secure any legislation providing recognition for these distinguished generals of our Army during this session of Congress. I call attention to the fact that Gen. Liggett retires before the next Congress meets. I do not want to take any action of this kind at the expense of any man who served in our Army, and I do think in doing this grateful act of justice to these distinguished leaders we are not detracting or taking away one penny or any right of the enlisted man. I would not stand for any legislation of any kind which would prevent doing our full duty by every man who served in the Army, but I call attention to the fact that we have been very lax in recognition of the men who led our armies in the World War, more so than any of the other countries allied with us. Even the countries to whom we are furnishing financial assistance are going ahead recognizing the work done by their great leaders of men. France only the other day created three new marshals in her army, and one of those men, a man who served in the provinces, merely keeping order in one of her provinces, never near the battle line. How different that is from the remarks we heard here concerning the distinguished man who stood at the head of the civilian help of our country in this great conflict and whose recognition would have been merely a recognition of the loyalty and patriotism and determination of the men of the draft boards and of every one of the activities engaged in the war work back home, recognition of the fact that all of war does not consist of service on the battle field.

In regard to this particular bill I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that there was a time during the period of our war when it was gloomy and dark and we would do almost anything to win victory; a period when England and France, as they expressed it, "had their backs to the wall," when our men were over there by the hundreds of thousands, and the high command said to Gen. Pershing, "You have never had an

American Army since the Civil War. You can not make a field army function; you have not the men here who have been trained in the work. Turn over to the French Army and to the English Army your men, your units, your organizations, let them fight with the French Army and with the English Army." Gen. Pershing stood out against this advice and refused the demands of the council of high command and refused to have American soldiers fight in any army except an American Army. [Applause.] We applauded him for that. We applauded the President of the United States for backing him up in his position in regard to that matter. What happened? Gen. Pershing himself formed the First Army and commanded it. When he formed the Second Army he put Gen. Liggett in command of the First Army and Gen. Bullard in command of the Second Army, and when he formed the Third Army Gen. Dickman was placed in command of that. Now, those three men, and the brave men under them, with Gen. Pershing in supreme command, made it possible for our Army to properly function in France; and I say we are only giving a proper recognition to every man who fought in the ranks and to every subordinate officer and every man all along the line when we say to these men, "For your distinguished services Congress gladly offers you this token of a Nation's gratitude." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this matter, in my judgment, is a very important one, and it is of such a character that we ought not to act upon it without being familiar with all the facts in connection with it. In the first place, this proposes to give the grade and rank of lieutenant general on the active list in our Army in peace time. As a matter of fact, from the manner in which our Army is organized there is no place for a lieutenant general in peace time. And that is a matter that ought to be taken into consideration. Furthermore, at no time in the history of our country have we ever had more than one officer enjoying this grade on the active list in time of peace. After the Spanish-American War there were a number of general officers given this honor, but no more than one of them enjoyed it at a particular time. Now, what does this amendment propose to do?

It proposes to take Gen. Liggett, who retires now in a very few days, a most excellent officer, a man who is entitled to every honor we can give him, but it is not necessary to go the full length at this time without consideration and put him on the active list of our Army as a lieutenant general in time of peace. But it does not stop there. It proposes to go down the line of major generals and pass over such men as Gen. Dickman, who retires in October next; it passes over Gen. John F. Morrison, Gen. Enoch Crowder, and over Gen. Leonard Wood—four great generals in our Army who will all retire prior to the date of the retirement of Gen. Bullard. Gen. Bullard is one of the great officers of our Army. I have not a word to say against him, but he does not retire until 1925, and I simply ask the question, Why is it that it is proposed to pass over the heads of men like Gens. Dickman, Leonard Wood, Morrison, and Crowder, all great generals, and put Gen. Bullard along with Gen. Liggett at this time when he does not retire until 1925? I want to say to the gentlemen of the House that we ought not to concur in the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have here before me the record of a number of distinguished generals of our Army. Among them is Gen. John L. Hines, a man who as major general, when the line was broken over in France, went up and down the line through heavy artillery fire and machine-gun fire steadying his men and getting the boys together. He walked up and down the line between the Sixteenth and Twenty-sixth Regiments of Infantry, if I remember the numbers correctly, but that general is passed over in this proposal. We ought to take up the matter of recognition of the services of the great generals of our Army and consider them together and discuss the matter in a dispassionate and patriotic way and show that we are trying to do something for the men of the Army as a whole, considering all the great officers of our Army, and not pick out in the closing hours of the session even a great general like Liggett, who retires in a few days, and couple him up with Gen. Bullard, who does not retire until 1925, and give them special consideration. So I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be voted down and that the motion of the gentleman from Kansas be concurred in. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, my objection to this particular amendment is based on the wording of

the amendment. I think it is most unfortunate that there should be any distinction made between generals who were in command of fighting units and generals of the S. O. S. or supply, whether in the supply department in France or in this country.

Now, if you will analyze the casualties among the generals in our Army you will find that not a single general was killed in action, and therefore I think it is unfortunate for us to make an invidious distinction between generals in command of fighting forces and, for example, Gen. Crowder and Gen. Wood in this country.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I will.

Mr. HICKS. Is it not a fact that Gen. Bullard and Gen. Liggett were the only two generals in command of armies?

Mr. FISH. Gen. Bullard's name and Gen. Liggett's name are not mentioned in this amendment. My point is simply this, that it is unfortunate that there should be any distinction. If you want to make a distinction and a proper one, make it between the doughboys who fought in the front line and the doughboys who were not fortunate enough to be ordered overseas, but not between generals who did not incur the same risk as the enlisted personnel and company officers. I believe in promoting and rewarding our distinguished generals, but this is neither the proper time nor method of doing so.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] to recede and concur.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, what is the motion. I just came in. I ask that it be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment No. 104 was again reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] to recede and concur.

The question was taken and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The vote is now on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 117, noes 6.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 105, page 72, line 8, insert: "That in the cases of officers then in the Army who were nominated to the Senate by the President for brevet commissions for service during the War with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition for extraordinary heroism or gallantry in action or especially meritorious services, such as to justify the award of the distinguished service cross or the distinguished service medal provided for in the act of July 9, 1918, such cases may be considered and acted on under the provisions of said act, notwithstanding that such recommendations may have been made more than three years before said cases shall have been considered as authorized by said act, but all consideration of, and action upon, any such case shall be based exclusively on official records of the War Department."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. I would like to make the statement that when the war with Spain was fought, and the Philippine insurrection, and the Chinese relief expedition, the Army had no distinguished service cross or medal. In those wars there were men of our Army who performed just as distinguished service, participated in just as heroic actions, as the soldiers of any other war. The only recognition that came to them for this was their nomination by the President for a brevet rank, which they never received, although mentioned in orders for distinguished conduct, and which now would entitle them to the distinguished service cross or distinguished service medal. There are about 300 of these men, and the conferees felt it would be the proper thing to do to award them the ribbon at this time.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] three minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the three minutes I want to make a preferential motion that the House do not concur in the Senate amendment.

This amendment provides that the officers in the Army at the time of the Philippine insurrection and the Spanish War should be awarded distinguished service crosses. As every Member of this House knows, there has been a great abuse during this war in the awarding of medals. There is not a Member of this House that does not realize that there have been

complaints from the enlisted personnel that they have been overlooked. And, as an officer in the war, and as an officer who has been decorated and therefore has no grievance, I am absolutely opposed to this amendment. What are we proposing to do? We are proposing by this amendment to give 300 officers, and no enlisted men, of the Spanish War decorations, if I read this amendment right.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I certainly will yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. I want to call to the gentleman's attention that during the Spanish War the law permitted the enlisted man who rendered distinguished service to receive what was called a certificate of merit. There was no reward open to the officer except the congressional medal of honor, which can only be given in exceptional cases. So that an officer of that war was deprived of any recognition, whereas the enlisted man did receive it in a certificate of merit.

Mr. FISH. That may be the case. But this is absolutely an improper time and method of bringing this amendment up, unless we are going into the consideration of the cases of the enlisted men. Undoubtedly there are a number of enlisted men who are qualified to receive these decorations. I believe that there were less men killed in the occupation of Cuba than there were on November 11, on armistice day.

Now you come in here and ask for 300 distinguished service medals for officers of that war. I believe this should go over until the next session of Congress. I might be very glad to vote for such a bill, but not until the enlisted men have had their day in court. I speak that way because I had a cousin, a sergeant in the Rough Riders, who was the first man killed in the Spanish War, and I want those men to have the same consideration and their families the same consideration, to secure a distinguished service cross, as Regular Army officers.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for one minute?

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman from Kansas allow me two or three more minutes?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he does not believe that an officer who served in the Spanish-American War or in the Philippine insurrection and rendered such service as would entitle an officer in the late war to this honor, the officer who served in the Spanish War or Philippine insurrection should have the same consideration at the hands of his Government as the officer who served in the late war?

Mr. FISH. I most certainly do.

Mr. McKENZIE. That is all there is to it.

Mr. FISH. I hope they will get it. At the same time, if you pass this legislation you are going to preclude the enlisted men, and I want to see them come in and get consideration.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I quite sympathize with the gentleman's views, but the law at that time provided that the enlisted man could get his, but the honor that came to the officer was a brevet rank. And so for the same service for which he now gets a cross he got a brevet rank then. But under the law it was necessary for those nominated for brevet rank to be confirmed by the Senate, and the nominations were sent in at such a late date that the confirmations failed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this motion and make a substitute motion that we disagree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I want to ask the chairman a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Has the chairman of this subcommittee taken into consideration the possibility that there might be some who have since died who were entitled to this consideration, and that probably the heirs of those would be glad to obtain these medals?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that is barely possible. But we were advised by the War Department that this language covers only the names of those officers who had been nominated by the President and whose nominations had been sent to the Senate immediately following those wars.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I take it that there were some whose names were sent to the Senate who have since died. If that

is true, it seems to me the heirs of those would be glad to receive a medal.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think, under the law governing the distribution of medals and distinguished service stars and distinguished service medals, if the soldier dies his family is entitled to receive it and does receive it.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Would it not be better to insert a provision that the heirs of a deceased officer entitled to this under the act shall receive it?

Mr. ANTHONY. I am quite sure that the general law now makes such provision.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Upon that assurance of the chairman, I will be content.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Why does not this amendment make provision for granting distinguished service medals to volunteer officers of the Spanish-American War?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know whether any brevet rank was granted to volunteer officers, but I presume it was not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There are many of them.

Mr. ANTHONY. We have volunteer officers who served in that war in the House. Among them is Col. CRAIG. He tells me they were not given them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes. That is the "nigger in the woodpile." This having been prepared to benefit a few officers of the Regular Army, it reads, "In cases of officers of the Army who were nominated in the Senate for brevet commissions for service during the war." My impression is that the law allows the President to confer brevet commissions on the volunteer officers without nominating them to the Senate.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CRAIG. The fact is that in 1898 and in 1899 the Volunteer officers serving were commissioned by the governors of the States, so that they could not, of course, come under the provisions of that act. I have my commission yet.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes. But you will find that on the face of it it says you were commissioned in the Federal service. That was done to obviate the labor of first commissioning an officer by the State and then later by the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAIG. But the gentleman will not say that those officers were nominated to the Senate and confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no. But it was not a State commission.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This applies only to officers of the Regular Army—at least, that is my impression—who served in the Spanish-American War and excludes Volunteer officers who served in the same war.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the gentleman must be mistaken. I do not think there would be any attempt on anybody's part to exclude a Volunteer officer.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think not, too. But the attempt was to take care of the officers of the Regular Army, and whoever drew this amendment was a Regular Army officer who was not interested in the gentlemen who served in the Spanish-American War as Volunteers and had been out of the service for many years. He was interested in getting a distinguished service medal for himself.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think what the gentleman says is quite true. At the time these nominations were made to the Senate most of the Volunteer officers in the Spanish-American War had been mustered out. But among these 300 officers whose nominations were sent to the Senate by the President were a number of Volunteer officers, quite a large number of them, who had remained in the service. We took hundreds of Volunteer officers into the Regular Army.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, I do not know what the facts are; and that leads me to believe that they, having waited 20 years or more, we might wait a few moments longer until somebody did know.

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee had in mind some 300 distinguished officers whose nominations for brevet rank had been sent to the Senate and who failed of confirmation. We thought it was the decent and proper thing to do to give them this recognition.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We are here a long time after the Spanish-American War closed. Has any bill ever been introduced on this subject?

Mr. ANTHONY. A bill is now pending in the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, introduced by the gentleman

from Washington [Mr. MILLER], who has been very urgent in trying to get it reported and brought before the House.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is that an argument in favor of it, that the Committee on Military Affairs would not report it favorably?

Mr. ANTHONY. The Committee on Military Affairs, as I understand, have failed to take action because they would have no show whatever to bring the bill onto the floor.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, that is not the case. Of course, if the gentleman from Washington introduced it yesterday, it would not have very much show.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; it has been pending for some time.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Committee on Military Affairs is now the committee on call on Calendar Wednesday. Until last week Calendar Wednesday came up every week, and the Committee on Military Affairs on any Wednesday for the last two months could have called up such a bill for consideration in the House.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me, of course I am not authorized to speak for the entire Committee on Military Affairs, but I am advised somewhat as to the state of the business of that committee. There were other matters which seemed to the committee to be of more pressing importance, and that more insistently demanded immediate consideration; but that, of course, ought not to prejudice and does not prejudice the merits of this particular bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Of course, the gentleman knows we have not had any Calendar Wednesday since December 15.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I know that any member of the Committee on Military Affairs could have objected to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday by unanimous consent, and if any Member had desired the consideration of any bill on the calendar he could have had his day. The fact is that Calendar Wednesday was dispensed with principally because the Committee on Military Affairs called up a claims bill which the House did not want to vote for and did not want to vote down.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman does not mean to charge that the Committee on Military Affairs are obstructionists?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They are obstructionists in this case, because the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is trying to put through the House now a provision relating to a matter 22 years old, and says it is pending before the Committee on Military Affairs and therefore ought to be passed by the House now, the Committee on Military Affairs having obstructed its report to the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield, just to allow me to convey the information that the gentleman from Kansas is not trying to put anything through the House. As conferees we accepted this amendment pressed upon us by the Senate, because we recognized that it had merit in it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As a conferee the gentleman could not accept it under the rules of the House, and the conferees have not accepted it.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is a meritorious piece of legislation, and as such the conferees indorsed it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As I say, you are trying to put it through the House, and I expect you will succeed, because under the new rule all you have to do is to move to recede and concur, and the House votes to do it.

Mr. FISH. There is an unfortunate feeling now among the reserve officers and National Guard officers to the effect that of the decorations handed out in this war the Regular Army got 50 per cent, whereas they represented only 5 per cent of the officers in our entire Army. Out of 210,000 officers there were less than 10,000 Regulars, yet they got 50 per cent of the decorations handed out to the officers of this war. I think we could well afford to vote this down and bring it up in proper course, where we could decorate the ones who merited it, and also the volunteer officers and soldiers of the Spanish War.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question being taken, the motion was rejected.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House further insist.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 106: Page 72, line 22, insert: "For the preparation of plans, the initiation of work, including the employment of all necessary engineering, technical, clerical, and other services, and for any and

every purpose connected therewith, for an increased water supply for the District of Columbia, in accordance with Potomac project 'E,' described in the report submitted by Maj. M. C. Tyler, Corps of Engineers, \$200,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas moves to recede and concur with an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANTHONY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "expended," in the last line of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "Provided, That 60 per cent of this sum shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and 40 per cent from the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a motion.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me make a statement first. This amendment appropriates \$200,000 to be paid on a 60-40 basis for the purpose of inaugurating the work of increasing the water supply of the District of Columbia.

The conferees had some doubts about the propriety of an amendment of this kind appearing on the Army appropriation bill until they were shown that the initial legislation providing for the present water supply of the District originated on an Army appropriation bill when Jefferson Davis was Secretary of War.

The statement has been made that if this second tunnel or conduit for bringing additional water from the Great Falls to the city is constructed, instead of a pipe line which other engineers have proposed, it will prevent the utilization of the falls for power purposes.

The conferees investigated that criticism very carefully, and we have the assurance of Col. Kutz, engineer officer of the District, and of Secretary of War Baker, who sat on a board which investigated this matter, and others, that there is no basis for such contention, and the conferees submit the proposition for the consideration of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. This initial expenditure of \$200,000 is going to result in an expenditure of how much?

Mr. ANTHONY. About \$9,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. This is the beginning of quite an expensive end.

Mr. ANTHONY. This is the beginning of the work. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to forcibly illustrate the danger that is likely to result from legislation by riders on appropriation bills. Here is one of the most important propositions that could be raised, as far as the District of Columbia is concerned, and before the House takes any action upon it I think it ought to know what it is doing or at least it ought to know that it does not know what it is doing.

It has never been considered by any legislative committee. The Engineers of the Army made a report a short time ago on the subject, but it is not yet available for the membership of the House. A few days ago the Senate ordered it printed as a Senate document, but it has not been delivered from the Public Printer, and I have been trying ever since I understood that the conferees were going to make this motion to get a copy of the report, but I have been unable to do so. I submit, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is not a Member of this House who has read the report of the Army Engineers. Certainly no committee of the House and no committee of the Senate has considered the proposition or considered any bill pertaining to it.

This is an amendment put on in the Senate to this appropriation bill, and as was said here the other day in regard to another matter it was put on because a Senator asked for it, and he happens to be a member of the conference committee. It ought not to be agreed to until the House knows what it is. If we adopt this amendment we will be putting ourselves in the same position we are in in regard to Muscle Shoals. This provides an appropriation of \$200,000 to start the project, and if we pass it we are irrevocably committed to the project. The gentleman from Kansas says it may cost \$9,000,000. Yes; and it may cost \$100,000,000. No one knows.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman concede the necessity of an additional water supply for the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. I do not concede it; I do not know. I know that we have had more people in the District of Columbia in the last two years than we have now, and we got along very nicely.

If we let this go over, Congress reconvenes in a few weeks and can take it up in an orderly manner. There is no need of getting hysterical about it, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said a few minutes ago in regard to the last amendment we voted on. We have gone along for a good many years without doing anything about the proposition, and it seems to me that we can go on for 15 minutes longer without taking this important action until it is properly considered. Congress will be back here in four or five weeks, and if this matter is important it can be referred to the regular committee and be reported back and acted upon intelligently. We ought not to embark on a proposition costing \$9,000,000 and perhaps \$100,000,000 without ever being considered by a legislative committee.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield to me to make a motion on a conference report?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman from New York for that purpose.

CLAIMS OF THE CHOCTAW, CHICKASAW, CHEROKEE, CREEK, AND SEMINOLE INDIANS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10105, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 10105. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims which the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, and Seminole Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, I do not think it is necessary to say it, but I hope the conferees will not agree to the amendment which may involve the country in an expense of many million dollars that has no connection with the original bill. I have such faith in the conferees that I will not object.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. SNYDER. Simply to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore appointed the following conferees: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, and Mr. CARTER.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan five additional minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas called attention to the fact that this was a rider affecting the District of Columbia upon an Army appropriation bill. It is doubly objectionable. First, it is a rider on the wrong appropriation bill; and, secondly, it is a rider affecting a very vital situation here in the District, which ought not to be passed upon any appropriation bill. The statement was made that this would not interfere with the development of the Great Falls power proposition. I do not know where gentlemen get their information, but I have a statement here appearing this morning in the Washington Herald, made by an eminent engineer, who says that there is no question but what it will interfere with the Great Falls power proposition. I submit that we ought to wait until a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate have had a chance to investigate on their own responsibility and find out whether that is true or not.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman think it would make any difference whether it interfered with the Great Falls water-power project or not? The most important thing in the world is the water supply to the human beings who live in the community, regardless of the fact that it might interfere with the Great Falls water-power project.

Mr. MAPES. I have no knowledge of any shortage of water here in the District of Columbia that would require any such hasty action as this.

We have gotten along very nicely for a good many years with the present facilities; we have gotten along the last two or three years, when there were more people in the District of Columbia than there will be again in a great many years to come.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I am sorry, but I have only a short time, and I can not yield. I call the attention of the House to the report of this engineer who has investigated this matter. He says:

It is not commonly known that the proposed appropriation of \$200,000 for preliminary work under the Tyler plan is an effort to commit the Congress to a scheme that will prohibit the construction of an efficient power development on the Potomac River.

If another tunnel is built at an elevation of 30 feet above the present one it will prevent a dam from being built at Great Falls. If the purpose is to get an additional supply of water for the District, a water main could be laid at one-tenth the cost and in one-fourth the time it would take to construct another tunnel.

A water main could be adapted or changed to conform to any dam location, but a tunnel once built will be a permanent barrier to any efficient power development.

There is the statement of an engineer. I do not know whether he is correct or the other people are correct, but I do know that we ought not to pass legislation of this importance upon an appropriation bill when the conferees have not seen the report upon which it is based, nor has any Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to move that the House further insist upon the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIEHLMAN].

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I consider this one of the most important propositions brought in on this bill. I take issue with the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]. This matter has been before Congress for 20 years. Away back in 1906 Congress appointed a commission to study sources of additional water supply for the District of Columbia, and there has been spent in investigations the sum of \$33,000. Last year during the last session of the present Congress we appropriated \$25,000 additional and authorized the water-power commission to make an investigation of the sources of additional supply, and this commission has made its report, based upon the findings of the Army engineers, and two propositions are submitted to Congress, one for an additional source of water supply and the other a water-power project. The Army engineers who investigated this matter agreed unanimously that the two should be separated, that the taking up of one proposition will not in any way endanger the other, and in that finding of the Army engineers the water-power commission, consisting of three members of the Cabinet, unanimously agree.

This proposition involves an expenditure of \$200,000 for initial work on this project as outlined in the report of Maj. Tyler. The city of Washington at the present time is dependent for its water supply upon a single conduit built 60 years ago. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], who is in favor of waiting awhile before taking up this proposition, makes the statement here that the water supply of the District has not been endangered. I agree with his statement in so far as that there have not been any evidences of water famine, but the facts are that the safe dependable water supply of the District of Columbia through the present conduit system is about 68,000,000 gallons per day. During the heated term last summer water was used to as high an amount as 75,000,000 gallons a day, while the present conduit system can not bring down more than 68,000,000 gallons a day as a supply upon which we can depend.

The Army engineers in charge of the conduit can not clear it of water for more than two days at a time, and it is therefore absolutely impossible to make repairs when needed. Therefore the city of Washington is dependent entirely upon a single source of supply. The need for increasing this supply has been apparent for years. Congress has attempted to deal with it by securing the very best technical advice upon the subject. The report of these Army engineers is now before Congress, and we are asked to make an initial appropriation of \$200,000.

Mr. CHINDELOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDELOM. If this work is done, may we hope that it will be unnecessary to press the bill to compel the Government to pay for water used in the District of Columbia, as I believe is contemplated by some bill introduced here?

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. I would say that if a source of additional supply is found, it will be unnecessary to take drastic steps to conserve the present supply, although the per capita consumption is greater than it should be. I introduced the resolution to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. RICKETTS. The same source of supply was in use during the period of the war, covering two years.

Mr. ZIEHLMAN. Away back in 1905 we were using about 65,000,000 gallons of water per day. During the peak of the

war-time influx of population we were able by metering the Government establishments and by conserving water and repairing leaks to maintain that usage of 65,000,000 gallons a day.

Mr. RICKETTS. There were a great many more people in Washington then than there are now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I am in sympathy with what the chairman of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia has to say about legislation going on an appropriation bill. Of course we did not put this legislation here, but there is a portion of this property which is not directly under the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia and which never has been. All of the water supply was originally a plan of the War Department to supply water primarily to the Government. There have been various changes made from time to time in respect to the method of permitting the citizens of the District of Columbia to use this water, but of late years legislative provision after legislative provision has gone onto the District of Columbia appropriation bill until the water system is maintained out of the District revenues, but the title to all of this property is in the War Department, and as was said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the chairman of this conference committee, the whole water supply was instituted by the War Department and all of this conduit was made by it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean to say that the water mains laid throughout the District of Columbia belong to the United States Government?

Mr. Sisson. No; the water-supply system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman made a mistake.

Mr. Sisson. The mains were originally laid, that is the conduit main, by the War Department.

Mr. MADDEN. Just the conduit?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; and the ancillary, or smaller mains, were originally charged up to the property owners of the District of Columbia, but I do not want to go into that at this time.

Now, this, in my judgment, might properly go upon the Army bill. I think, as a matter of fact, it might go upon a Regular Army bill just as logically as it could go on a District of Columbia legislative bill. I think either committee that the Speaker might refer this matter to would have jurisdiction of it. Now, as to the question whether this ought to have gone on this appropriation bill, not the Army legislative bill, but this appropriation bill, it is subject to the criticism we usually get. Now, when the Senate puts these amendments on, as they contend they have the right to do, we are compelled to bring this matter back and submit it to you for your consideration. Now, so far as the information was concerned, as it was stated to you, this matter has been gone into in detail. But, mark you, this; It is more in the nature of the preparation of plans than it is for the actual beginning of work. I do not know whether I myself would be willing to commit myself to the proposition of developing water power or not, but I do know that while there is no particular alarm about the water situation, the maximum capacity is more than 68,000,000 gallons a day, but the safety point is estimated by the engineers to be 68,000,000 gallons a day, and they have gone over seventy-odd millions a day for several months during the summer season; I do not know just exactly what the greatest capacity would be, but there has been no great danger of water; in fact, you have got more than three days' supply already stored in the reservoirs throughout the territory of the District, but in my judgment this is the time to have an investigation made, because the growth of the city has been so abnormal within the last few years that the time is rapidly approaching when you have got to do this work.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Is it a fact the excessive use of water in recent times is owing to the prohibition amendment?

Mr. Sisson. Well, I am inclined to believe it reduces the consumption of water, because the morning after the man usually drinks a good deal of water, but the gentleman has had more experience than I have and therefore I will not testify as an expert.

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. CROWTHER. Does not the gentleman think that the great danger is not in the fact that the general supply is only between sixty-eight and ninety million gallons but in the fact it is conducted in a single pipe line, and in a good water system to-day there is a double pipe line, so while they repair one they could use the other?

Mr. SISSON. This line was built under the direction of Jefferson Davis when he was Secretary of War, and as an evidence of the fact he did a magnificent job the conduit is the only portion of the water system that has given them absolutely no trouble.

Mr. CROWTHER. I agree that they did better work in those days.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Under the reading of the amendment, which says it is to initiate the work, if we should appropriate the \$200,000 here, does not the gentleman think we are committed to this proposition as set forth in the Tyler plan?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I think that is true. I would like to have two more minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I think that would be absolutely true.

Mr. SNELL. Then there would not be any question but what we would go on with this if we once started?

Mr. SISSON. In my judgment, when Uncle Sam puts his hand to the plow he never turns back unless we make an exception of Muscle Shoals, and I hope we will not do that, because we have put our hands to the plow and we ought not to turn back, and we will not turn back, because Mr. Weeks as Secretary of War—

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask one more question—

Mr. SISSON. I have the yielding—and when he becomes Secretary of War he will not only provide for Muscle Shoals properly but at the same time I believe he will be able to help handle this water supply of the District of Columbia. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, prior to about 1860 the water supply in the District of Columbia, both for the Government and for the people, was gotten from wells, cisterns, and springs. The spring in Franklin Square furnished water for the White House. It is now an underground stream, carried away into a sewer. Commencing about 1860 the present conduit was built. It was built entirely at the expense of the Federal Government for the purpose of furnishing the official buildings with water. After water had been brought into the District of Columbia in that way the people of the District of Columbia asked permission to connect with this end of the conduit for the purpose of getting water. That was granted. More and more, year after year, has been granted. All the time the people of the District of Columbia were getting water cheaper than any other city in the world. If the people here had to pay a reasonable price for the water they get, there would be no apprehension of a scarcity; and there is no real apprehension of a scarcity. It is a well-known fact there is an abundance of water here for the District of Columbia, but there is not enough to reach out in the adjoining jurisdictions which seek to get water at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. RICKETTS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. RICKETTS. Does the gentleman mean to say that the citizens of Washington are getting water free, without paying for it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; but they have been paying a very small price for it.

Mr. RICKETTS. Does the gentleman know how much?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No; I do not. Recently the price was slightly increased, and when the price was only slightly increased the consumption of water was reduced.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. SNELL. How far outside are they trying to take the water at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Into adjoining States.

Mr. SNELL. Into the State adjoining?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. HICKS. I understood the gentleman to state that the rates for water here in Washington are exceptionally low?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I am surprised at that statement, for the reason that I have a house here of about the same size as my house in New York City, and the water rates here are about the same as in New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The gentleman is the only man to be found in the District of Columbia that would make such a statement. There must be a leak or a mistake somewhere.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that my own experience is somewhat different. My own bill for all purposes connected with the House, including lawn privilege, is about \$8 a year. It is about half of what I pay for water in a small town in Michigan.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I have not the time, unless the gentleman will yield me more time.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I know the gentleman would not wish to make a misstatement. I call his attention to the fact that the District of Columbia has \$4,000,000 invested in what they call a purification plant, which is under Government control—under control of the engineers. And I am reading now from the report of the engineer in charge. Nearly half of the cost of the present system was paid for by the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It was paid for in this way: When the people at this end of the conduit—the people of the District of Columbia—were connected, water was distributed to them, and they paid only a small charge for it, and the money they paid went to the credit of the District of Columbia, and they took that money and extended the pipe system, and now they own it. They acquired it by collecting rent for water that the Federal Government brought into the District of Columbia and almost gave to them. When this amendment was put on there was no provision except that the Federal Government should build another conduit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman three more minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. To-day, in a private discussion among several of us here on the floor, attention was called to the fact that the District of Columbia was to get the benefit of this proposed new conduit without paying a cent for its construction. But now an amendment has been offered providing that the District of Columbia shall pay 60 per cent and the Federal Government 40 per cent of its cost. This House is on record, overwhelmingly so, several times, that the 60 per cent and the 40 per cent basis was all wrong; and yet by this amendment you wish to estop Congress in the future from arriving at a just contribution from the District of Columbia by fastening in this resolution the per cents of 60 and 40. I say that this should not be done; but whatever the Government is to contribute should be contributed under the provisions of the Mapes bill, which passed this House overwhelmingly, but which has been ignored at the other end of the Capitol in order that favoritism might be shown to the people here to the detriment of the people in the rest of the United States. I sincerely trust that this proposition may be voted down.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield to an inquiry?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. GARD. I want to ask if this Potomac project "E" is a purely power project?

Mr. ANTHONY. We are informed the present project is purely a water project with power possibilities in the future.

Mr. GARD. Is there any commitment of any legislative body to this project "E"?

Mr. MAPES. I can not answer the question of the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think this matter can be stated in a few general propositions. First, it is necessary to enlarge the water supply of the District of Columbia. The present water supply flows through a single conduit from the Great Falls of the Potomac. That, as has been stated, is a brick conduit, the construction of which was begun in 1853. Two years ago, according to the Tyler report, the volume of water brought by means of that conduit had reached a point where there was no longer the assurance of a sufficient supply. In addition, it is pointed out in the Tyler report that the conditions are now such that it is impossible to unwater that conduit for more than two days at a time, and therefore repairs can not be made. And as repairs can not be made, the report says that a breakdown is liable to occur at any moment, which would create a water famine in this community. Now, as has been stated, there have been inquiries from time to time into the situation, and the most recent survey is by the engineers of the War Department, with the result that I have indicated.

If there were time to send to the Clerk's desk and have read the report on this point of the engineers—the Tyler report—it would afford the most impressive evidence that can be had as to the existing necessity and danger.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the report that the gentleman refers to show this: That it takes just about as long to clear the conduit by pumping as the storage supply would last? In other words, there would not be any time after you cleared the conduit in which to repair it during which time the city would be supplied with water?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; the remarkable condition exists that there is a single conduit upon which this city and the District are dependent and no means of repairing it. It is a brick tunnel, something over 60 years old, and is liable to go out of use at any time through an accident.

Now, can there be anything more serious for the House to consider?

The second proposition is that no one except the man who has been quoted by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] believes, so far as I understand, that there is any sort of connection between the matter of the water supply and the matter of the possible development of the water power of the Potomac River. When the gentleman quoted the unofficial engineer whom he has in mind I called up Maj. William B. Harrison, one of the engineers who worked under Tyler, and he stated that no such connection is involved. I also called up Mr. Hardy, who is in charge of the filtration plant of the District, and he made the same reply. So no one need think that in voting for this measure he runs any risk whatever of impeding the water-power development plan.

That may be left out of the case absolutely, and if my friend from Michigan had kept up with the matter by attending the sessions of the power commission and taken the trouble, as I have done, to secure a copy of the Tyler report and studied it, he would not have accepted the view that has been put into the newspapers by the engineer he has quoted.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Perhaps the gentleman can answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as to whether Congress has ever settled upon a program for this work? I will say to the gentleman that I have other work to do besides attending the meetings of the engineers.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If Congress had acted heretofore, of course, this bill would not be before the House.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman think this is the orderly procedure for Congress to adopt?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do. When the engineers and the Water Power Commission inform us that it will take a considerable time to complete the work of constructing a new conduit, and that delay will put the entire matter where there will be constant peril to the people of the District and to all the interests of the District. And unless there is some better reason that can be given for the delay than any thus far assigned, I protest that action should not be postponed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. CRAMTON. The estimate is that this work will require \$9,000,000, and we are beginning with an appropriation of \$200,000. At that rate it would take about 50 years, would it not?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is not the way to state it. An initial appropriation of \$200,000 is asked for now. If sufficient additional appropriations are made hereafter the work will be completed in about two and one-half years.

Another thing, and this is the third proposition, is that the engineers have reached the conclusion that the plan E, as designated in this bill, is the most economical plan that can be adopted. There is no way to get water out of the Potomac, either at or above the Chain Bridge, that can be executed for less than \$9,000,000, which is what plan E will cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the Federal Government pay for the water it uses in the public buildings in the District of Columbia, and, if so, at what rate?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand that it does not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman whether or not the water is brought to the Federal Government through its own conduit, a conduit that it has built at its own expense?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can not say as to that, but I think such details are immaterial. The larger matter is the need of water here and the necessity of making provision for a greater supply. Whatever be the answer to the question as to who pays or who does not pay, I can not see that the fact bears on the essential issue with which we are dealing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia whether he shares the opinion that we see expressed in the public press every day that the Federal Government should be made to pay for the water which it brings into its buildings through a conduit built by itself at its own expense?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have no opinion on that point, and I do not see that that point is drawn into the consideration of this measure. The main thing, as I have tried to state, is the urgency of the case with reference to the necessity of the increase of the water supply. It seems to me that there ought not to be any hesitation about taking action. If we hesitate now there is no guaranty whatever that steps can be taken to initiate this work at any early date during the next session of Congress, and every day and every hour of delay increases the danger to which the people of the District are subjected. [Applause.]

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the parliamentary situation will permit it, I am going to ask for a division of the question and am going to offer a substitute that the entire amount of this appropriation be paid out of the funds of the District of Columbia and not out of the United States Treasury. If the matter is as urgent as is made out by those who are supporting the appropriation, most assuredly the District can afford to stand for the appropriation. It seems passing strange that if it is as important as it is claimed by those who are supporting it that the engineer should not have discovered it before the closing hours of this session of Congress; and if the engineer who is in charge and those who are taking care of the situation have not been vigilant enough to discover it a little sooner, it seems to me their opinion is not worth acting upon so hastily and hurriedly. Now, I am tired of this rushing in here with appropriations in the closing hours of a Congress. If appropriations are to be had or legislation of this character is to be enacted, the engineer and those in charge of the work ought to go before the proper committee and present the matter in the regular way. If these conduits and this water plant have been needed all these years, why is it that those engineers have not brought it before the proper committee and had proper hearings in order to start this work before this great emergency arose?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I want to answer the gentleman's question by telling him that this matter is here now because of its urgency, and at the request of the Secretary of War.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Of course, the Secretary of War did not go down and crawl through the water main. He is taking the word and the recommendation of an engineer who has made the investigation. Now my friend from Virginia [Mr. Moore], who is usually very conservative, comes before us in the habiliments of a ghost and tells us about the urgency that now exists. I understand from a number of members of the committee that this ghost has been stalking around for several years. Some one is always coming up here hoping to get work started in the closing hours of the session. They not only ask for this appropriation for the plans, but also ask for the appropriation for engineering and for clerical help and for anything that may be necessary to get this thing on its feet and started.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. And that would include condemnation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That would include condemnation. Now, if the water supply for the District of Columbia is in such danger, why is it that those whose business it is to keep that water supply in working order did not discover it in time to present it to a committee in the regular way and let the proper committee consider this and present it in regular order and in due course of business? I for one will not vote to appropriate \$200,000 to start a project of this size in order to save a delay of some three or four weeks.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do I understand that there have been any hearings, either here or in the Senate, on this project? I myself am not informed.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am not informed, but I take it that there were no hearings. There has been no mention of hearings by those who are supporting the project. If there were hearings, it seems to me that if the proposition has merit the proper committee that should have charge of this ought to have presented the matter of the water supply of the District, especially if it is so serious that the water supply is going to break down and we are going to perish during the intermission between now and the next session of Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A gentleman at my side says there have been hearings.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If there were hearings, then either that committee is not willing to do what is necessary to furnish a water supply or else the Committee on Appropriations is acting hastily in starting a \$9,000,000 project in the closing hours of the session.

Mr. ANTHONY. I move the previous question on the motion.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield to the gentleman to offer his motion.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion and have it pending that the House further insist on its disagreement.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I desire to have a division and then offer a substitute.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman can not do that now; we will have to have a division first.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Mr. JONES of Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a division, and the question is on the motion to recede.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were 55 ayes and 39 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present; the Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 82, answered "present" 3, not voting 115, as follows:

YEAS—227.

Almon	Dyer	Kearns	Oldfield
Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Keller	Oliver
Andrews, Nebr.	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Osborne
Anthony	Elliott	Kendall	Overstreet
Bakka	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett
Bacharach	Esch	Kettner	Paige
Bankhead	Evans, Mont.	Kiess	Park
Bee	Fairfield	King	Pell
Begg	Farr	Kinkaid	Perlman
Benham	Fess	Knutson	Peters
Benson	Fields	Lampert	Porter
Bland, Ind.	Fish	Larsen	Pou
Bland, Va.	Fisher	Lazaro	Purnell
Brand	Flood	Lea, Calif.	Quin
Brinson	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Henry T.
Brooks, Ill.	Fordney	Lehibach	Raker
Brooks, Pa.	Foster	Leshner	Ramsey
Browne	Freeman	Linthicum	Randall, Calif.
Buchanan	Fuller	Little	Randall, Wis.
Burdick	Gallivan	Longworth	Reber
Butler	Ganly	Luce	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett	Lufkin	Reed, W. Va.
Byrns, Tenn.	Glynn	McArthur	Rhodes
Campbell, Kans.	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Robinson, N. C.
Campbell, Pa.	Goodykoontz	McKinley	Robison, Ky.
Candler	Gould	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rogers
Cantrill	Green, Iowa	McLeod	Rouse
Chindblom	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Rowe
Christopherson	Greene, Vt.	Magge	Sanders, Ind.
Cleary	Griest	Martin	Sanders, N. Y.
Coady	Griffin	Mays	Schall
Collier	Haugen	Mead	Scott
Crago	Hawley	Merritt	Shreve
Cramton	Hays	Miligan	Siegel
Cullen	Hernandez	Minahan, N. J.	Sims
Currie, Mich.	Hickey	Monahan, Wis.	Sinnott
Dale	Hicks	Montell	Sisson
Dallinger	Hoch	Montague	Siemp
Darrow	Holland	Moore, Ohio	Smith, Idaho
Davey	Houghton	Moore, Va.	Stegall
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Ind.	Stedman
Davis, Tenn.	Hull, Tenn.	Morin	Stephens, Miss.
Dempsey	Humphreys	Mott	Stevenson
Denison	Husted	Mudd	Stoll
Dickinson, Mo.	Igoe	Nelson, Mo.	Strong, Kans.
Doremus	Jacoway	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Pa.
Dunbar	Johnson, Va.	Nolan	Swindall
Dupré	Johnson, Miss.	O'Connell	Swope
	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ogden	Tague

Taylor, Tenn.
Thompson
Tilson
Timberlake
Upshaw
Vaile
Venable
Vestal

Vinson
Voigt
Volk
Volstead
Ward
Wason
Watson
Weaver

Welling
Welly
Whaley
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Williams
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.

Winslow
Wood, Ind.
Woods, Va.
Woodyard
Wright
Yates
Zihman

NAYS—82.

Anderson
Ashbrook
Barbour
Barkley
Black
Blanton
Boies
Bowling
Box
Briggs
Cannon
Caraway
Carrs
Carter
Connally
Curry, Calif.
Dickinson, Iowa
Dominick
Drane
Echols
Edmonds

Evans, Nebr.
Frear
French
Graham, Ill.
Hadley
Hardy, Colo.
Hastings
Hayden
Hersey
Huddleston
Hudspeth
Hutchinson
Ireland
Jeffers
Johnson, Ky.
Jones, Pa.
Jones, Tex.
Kraus
Lanham
Lankford
Layton

McClintic
McKenzie
McKeown
McLaughlin, Mich.
McPherson
MacGregor
Mann, Ill.
Mansfield
Mapes
Michener
Miller
Nelson, Wis.
Newton, Mo.
O'Connor
Parrish
Patterson
Radcliffe
Ransley
Rayburn
Ricketts
Rose

Sherwood
Sinclair
Snell
Snyder
Stephens, Ohio
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Tillman
Tinkham
Treadway
Walsh
Webster
Wheeler
Wingo
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.

ANSWERING PRESENT—3.

Clark

Crisp

Dowell

NOT VOTING—115.

Ackerman
Aswell
Ayres
Baer
Bell
Bland, Mo.
Bowers
Britten
Brumbaugh
Burke
Caldwell
Carew
Casey
Classon
Cole
Cooper
Copley
Costello
Crowther
Dent
Dewalt
Donovan
Dooling
Doughton
Drewry
Dunn
Ellsworth
Emerson
Evans, Nev.

Ferris
Gallagher
Gandy
Gard
Garner
Godwin, N. C.
Good
Goodall
Goodwin, Ark.
Graham, Pa.
Hamill
Hamilton
Carew
Hardy, Tex.
Harrell
Harrison
Hersman
Hill
Hoey
Howard
Hulings
James, Mich.
Johnson, Wash.
Johnston, N. Y.
Juul
Kahn
Kelly, Pa.
Kennedy, Iowa
Kincheloe
Kitchin

Klecza
Kreider
Langley
Lomergan
Luhning
McAndrews
McCulloch
McDuffie
McFadden
McGlennan
Maher
Major
Mann, S. C.
Mason
Moon
Mooney
Murphy
Neely
Nicholls
Olney
Parker
Phelan
Rainey, Ala.
Rainey, John W.
Ramseyer
Reavis
Riddick
Riordan
Rodenberg

Romjue
Rowan
Rube
Rucker
Sabath
Sanders, La.
Sanford
Scully
Scars
Sells
Small
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Mich.
Smith, N. Y.
Smithwick
Steele
Steenerson
Stines
Sullivan
Sweet
Thomas
Tinch
Towner
Vare
Walters
Watkins
Wilson, Ill.
Wise

So the motion to recede was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. TOWNER with Mr. CRISP.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. BELL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. SWINDALL with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. TINCER with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. McANDREWS.

Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. GANDY.

Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. STINES with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. DUNN with Mr. HERSMAN.

Mr. LUHRING with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. ROMJUE.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. ASWELL.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. BARKLEY.

Mr. BENHAM with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. KINCHELOE.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. McGLENNAN.

Mr. SELLS with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. BOWERS with Mr. RUBEY.

Mr. SWEET with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. McDUFFIE.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. RAMSEYER with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. COLE with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. MURPHY with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. KRIEDER with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. JUUL with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. OLNEY.
Mr. DOWELL with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. HILL with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. MAHER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
The doors were opened.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. ANTHONY. But, Mr. Speaker, I made a motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I offer a substitute for that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not offer a substitute; the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I gave notice that I would offer a substitute, and sent the amendment to the desk before the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. But there was no understanding about it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I may have misunderstood the gentleman from Kansas, but I understood that it would be considered.

Mr. ANTHONY. My motion to recede and concur was a preferential motion and would have to be disposed of first. If that was voted down, then the gentleman could offer his substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to concur with an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. A parliamentary inquiry. Will the substitute which I offer be in order if the motion of the gentleman from Kansas is voted down?

The SPEAKER. It will not.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I offered the substitute prior to the time the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the substitute was never reported.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It was not reported but I offered it in the colloquy and I understood that it could be considered. I think the gentleman from Kansas so understood it.

Mr. ANTHONY. No; I think I made a clear statement that my motion would first have to be disposed of; or at least I intended to convey that information.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There was some confusion at the time and I might have misunderstood the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to concur with an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, is it permissible to demand a division of this question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is not. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The House having receded, is not the amendment first to be put, before the motion to concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moved to recede and concur with an amendment. A division of the question was made and the House voted to recede. The Chair would think that the vote came now on the motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the previous question had not been ordered, the question would not be put on the motion to concur with an amendment; if some one else first offers an amendment, the question would be on agreeing to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment the other gentleman offered?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. On both, I would think.

The SPEAKER. If an amendment was pending, or if the previous question had not been ordered, the first motion would be on the amendment to the amendment, and then the Chair thinks the vote would still be on the motion to concur with an amendment, either as amended or not amended. The Chair thinks the vote is on the motion to concur with an amendment. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to concur with an amendment. The gentleman from Texas has demanded a division.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 99, noes 9.

So the motion to concur with an amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 113: After the figures "\$4,000," in line 6, page 82, insert: "Provided, That these civilian instructors employed in the department of modern languages and the department of tactics shall

be entitled to public quarters and to the same allowances with respect to fuel and light as those of a first lieutenant when occupying public quarters."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this is to put back into the bill language which went out on a point of order. It is a provision that has been carried in the Military Academy appropriation bill for many years. We offered this amendment which, instead of providing the allowances of a second lieutenant to these civilian instructors, simply provides them with quarters, fuel, and light. I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Anthony moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "Provided, That these civilian instructors employed in the department of modern languages and the department of tactics shall be entitled to public quarters and fuel and light."

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Does this include all of the instructors? Mr. ANTHONY. No; it refers to only two instructors. All of the other instructors have quarters and fuel and light.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ask for a further conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. SLEMP, Mr. DENT, Mr. SISSON.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 31, 32, 33, 79, 80, 82, 115, 116, and 119 to the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 79 and 80, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$501,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,649,270"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,147,770"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$382,810"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 119: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 119, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu

of the sum proposed insert "\$36,404,259"; and the Senate agree to the same.

SYDNEY ANDERSON,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

A. J. GRONNA,
WM. S. KENYON,
E. D. SMITH,
THOS. P. GORE,
CHAS. L. McNABY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there were only two major items involved in the proposition under consideration in the conference. The first of these was amendment No. 31, which provides for the congressional seed distribution. Upon that amendment the Senate recedes. The other major proposition was the amendment inserted by the Senate providing for loans to farmers for the purchase of seeds in the drought-stricken sections of the country. Upon that proposition the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the House amendment. The remaining amendments involve only totals, with one exception, which is the item for an assistant in the seed distribution, which goes along with the congressional seed distribution.

Mr. LONGWORTH. So that the loan now is limited to \$2,000,000?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; \$2,000,000 instead of \$5,000,000, and the maximum loan to each farmer is \$200 instead of \$300.

Mr. GARRETT. This ends the differences between the two Houses?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. And it is a complete report?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on March 2, 1921, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 15872. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis;

H. R. 9794. An act for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias;

H. R. 11945. An act for the relief of W. C. Stewart;

H. R. 12005. An act for the relief of Henry P. Corbin; and

H. R. 13402. An act for the purchase of land occupied by experimental vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 11572. An act for the relief of the John E. Moore Co.;

H. R. 12634. An act for the relief of Wilhelm Alexanderson;

H. R. 12045. An act to provide for the conveyance of lots on low grounds of Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 16100. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8067. An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13225. An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5032. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Shirland Avenue, in the city of Beloit, Wis.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from the Select Committee on the United States Shipping Board operations for printing, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts submits a report on the Shipping Board operations. It is ordered printed.

POSTMASTER GENERAL BURLESON.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I have here a communication addressed to me by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who will be minority leader in the next House, to which is attached an address defending the Postmaster General against a newspaper attack. He has asked me to read the communication into the RECORD, it will probably occupy five or six minutes of time, and I ask unanimous consent to send the letter and address to the Clerk to be read at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to have read at the Clerk's desk the letter to which he refers. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I object. The gentleman from Oklahoma will not let anybody else in here with any extension of remarks. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the objection. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, March 1, 1921.

DEAR HENRY: Here is a statement which I have prepared. I hope you will put it in the RECORD for me, since I fear I will not be able to be down before Congress adjourns. My doctors state that I will be all right in a few days.

Your friend,

CLAUDE KITCHIN.

[Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, but for my untimely illness the statement I purpose making now would have been made during the last session of Congress. I am not content, however, to permit this session of Congress to expire without conclusively demonstrating the gross falsity and injustice of the statement upon which I shall now comment.

Shortly before the return of the President from his last trip to Europe, in one of the most mendacious sheets published in America, the New York World, a paper constantly given to misrepresenting and slandering public officials, an editorial was printed, which was carried under the caption "Burleson," and the following excerpt is taken therefrom:

When Mr. Wilson was elected President he had had little experience in national politics. He had dealt with principles and ideas rather than with politicians and organizations. His advisers urged him to follow precedent and name a Postmaster General who could attend to the political affairs of the administration, and as bad luck would have it Albert Sidney Burleson, of Texas, was selected.

Mr. Burleson had had a great deal of political experience. He had served eight terms in Congress from the Austin district, and Mr. Wilson's advisers insisted that inasmuch as Mr. Burleson possessed exceptional knowledge of the ways of Congress he would prove invaluable as a link between the executive and legislative departments of the Government. The prospectus was alluring, but the goods were never delivered.

Taking the record of the last six years, the Burleson appointment, on the whole, has proved the most unfortunate that the President ever made—unfortunate for Mr. Wilson himself, unfortunate for his administration, unfortunate for the Democratic Party, and unfortunate for the country. Mr. Bryan was a sorry misfit as Secretary of State, but Mr. Bryan's selection was inevitable, and in naming him Mr. Wilson followed the political traditions of the country. Moreover, Mr. Bryan's opportunities for mischief were narrowly circumscribed, because Mr. Wilson, in reality, was his own Secretary of State and decided all questions of policy. There have been no such restraints upon Mr. Burleson. He has roamed at large, been allowed to administer his office in his own amazing way, and the consequences are appalling.

Instead of being a link between the President and Congress, he has been a source of continuing contention. Disliked and distrusted at the Capitol, he has made the President's relations with Congress more difficult. As a political adviser to the President he has been a Democratic tragedy. If there has been any instance in which Mr. Wilson has not involved himself in trouble by taking counsel of Albert Sidney Burleson, we should like to know when it happened.

Mr. Speaker, the statements in this editorial were either true or false, and if not true, their falsity should be easily demonstrable.

There are three distinct assertions set forth therein. First, that Burleson was disliked by his former congressional associates. Second, that he was distrusted by those associates. Third, that as "a link between the Executive and the Congress" he has been "a source of continuing contention" and "has made the President's relations with Congress more difficult."

First. Is it true that Burleson was disliked by Members of Congress with whom he had served for 14 years?

At the time he resigned from Congress in 1913 to enter the Cabinet Mr. Burleson was the ranking majority member on one of our most important committees—Appropriations—and had been a member of this committee for years. He had just been unanimously elected, without being a candidate for the honor, chairman of the caucus of his party members. He was universally respected by his fellows because of his recognized ability, his high character, and sterling integrity, and notwithstanding his rugged and unwavering partisanship he numbered among his friends and now enjoys the affectionate regard of many among the older Members on the other side of this Chamber. Every man here who knew Burleson liked him and knows full well without further statement from me that the statement made that he was disliked by his former associates is absolutely false and without a scintilla of evidence to support it.

Second. Was he distrusted by his former associates?

Mr. Speaker, the grant of appropriations asked by him is a fair measure of the confidence of the Congress in a Cabinet officer. I now assert without fear of contradiction that never has the Congress shown greater confidence in a Cabinet officer than it has given to Postmaster General Burleson. The fact is known of all Members of this body, and testimony in support thereof has often been borne, by the opposition members on the great Committee of Appropriations that he is one Cabinet officer in whom they have such confidence that they always give him what he asks because, to quote from one of the most distinguished members of the opposition, "He never asks for anything in the way of an appropriation that is not allowed for the reason that he never asks for anything unless actually needed."

Thus it is shown, Mr. Speaker, that the statement that he was distrusted by his former associates is as vile a slander as was ever directed against a public official.

Now, is there any truth in the third philippic directed by this maliciously mendacious sheet against Albert Sidney Burleson?

It was a well-recognized fact, approved at the White House, and known to every chairman of an important committee of the Congress that during the Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses the Postmaster General was "the link between the President and the Congress," just as has been stated by this paper in its editorial—the only true statement in the entire editorial. That fact is not denied, but the issue is whether he has been "a source of continuing contention" and had "made the President's relations with Congress more difficult."

Mr. Speaker, it will be admitted by even the partisan opposition that during the first six years of Woodrow Wilson's administration a very remarkable program of constructive legislation was enacted into law. Many of these measures were bitterly contested. Frequently they were passed through the Congress by a very narrow margin of votes. I now assert, and this assertion will be assented to by every chairman of an important committee dealing with this program of legislation, that President Wilson will perhaps never know in how great a degree the Postmaster General contributed to the passage of these measures. At many strategical points his timely aid and influence helped save the day. This fact will be gladly acknowledged by the gentlemen who were in charge of the various measures and will not be denied by anyone who is in a position to speak the truth. Sometimes many, if not all, of the leaders on both sides of this Chamber were in opposition and yet, Mr. Speaker, for six years the administration had the unparalleled record of never having lost a legislative battle, and honesty and truth compels the statement that Albert Sidney Burleson is entitled to no little credit for this accomplishment, as we all know. I speak in the presence of the men who know the truth and I unhesitatingly say that a more unjust falsehood was never uttered than that made in this editorial that Burleson made the President's relations with Congress more difficult. Just the reverse is true, and I speak from a full knowledge of all the facts. More than once he made the way smoother, more than once he aided in overcoming what might otherwise have become insurmountable difficulties.

This, Mr. Speaker, was true with reference to the passage of the Federal reserve act, the tariff act, the farm loan act, the canal tolls act, the Alaskan Railway act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, as well as the acts growing out of the World War, like the draft act, the McLemore resolution, and others too numerous to mention.

Thus it is seen, Mr. Speaker, when the light of truth is turned upon these editorial denunciations of the Postmaster General they are clearly shown to be a tissue of malignant falsehoods.

We all know the animus of these newspaper and magazine criticisms of Burleson. The underlying reason for all this denunciation of him is the fact that second-class postage rates, which had been talked about for 30 years, were put over during his administration as Postmaster General. I myself had charge of the bill which increased the rates in second-class mail matter, and know that Burleson was largely instrumental in its passage, and I gladly recognize the great service he rendered in that matter. Because of his courage and honesty as a public official it was sought by those who have been feeding at the public trough, and whose feet he has lifted out of that trough, to make the people believe that he is disliked and distrusted. The effort has failed. The record has been made and speaks for itself.

INCORPORATING NATIONAL CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC OF AMERICA.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the suspension of the rules and the passing of the bill on which a division was held last evening. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1531. An act to amend an act approved March 3, 1891, incorporating the National Conservatory of Music of America.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The House divided.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in doubt.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 97, noes 30.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair thinks there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 203, noes 60, answered "present" 1, not voting 163, as follows:

YEAS—203.

Andrews, Md.	Fess	Luce	Scott
Andrews, Nebr.	Fish	McKeown	Sells
Anthony	Flisher	McKiniry	Shreve
Ashbrook	Focht	McLaughlin, Mich.	Siegel
Bakka	Freeman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Bacharach	French	McLeod	Sinnot
Barbour	Gallivan	MacGregor	Smith, Idaho
Begg	Ganly	Magee	Smith, Ill.
Benham	Good	Major	Snell
Benson	Goodykoontz	Mann, Ill.	Snyder
Black	Gould	Mansfield	Stedman
Bland, Va.	Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Stephens, Ohio
Brand	Green, Iowa	Martin	Strong, Kans.
Brinson	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Strong, Pa.
Brooks, Ill.	Griest	Mead	Summers, Wash.
Burdick	Griffin	Michener	Sweet
Burroughs	Hadley	Miller	Swindall
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Colo.	Minahan, N. J.	Swope
Campbell, Kans.	Hastings	Monahan, Wis.	Tague
Campbell, Pa.	Haugen	Mondell	Taylor, Colo.
Cannon	Hawley	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Caraway	Hayden	Moore, Va.	Temple
Carss	Hernandez	Moore, Ind.	Thompson
Carter	Hersey	Marin	Tilson
Chindblom	Hersman	Mott	Timberlake
Christopherson	Hickey	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Cleary	Hicks	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Coady	Holland	O'Connell	Vaile
Crago	Houghton	Ogden	Vestal
Cullen	Hull, Iowa	Osborne	Voigt
Currie, Mich.	Humphreys	Padgett	Volk
Dale	Husted	Park	Walsh
Dallinger	Hutchinson	Parker	Ward
Darrow	Igoe	Patterson	Wason
Devey	Ireland	Pell	Watson
Dempsey	Jeffers	Perlman	Weaver
Denison	Johnson, S. Dak.	Purnell	Webster
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Radcliffe	Welty
Donovan	Keller	Rainey, Henry T.	Wheeler
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	White, Kans.
Drane	King	Randall, Calif.	White, Me.
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Kraus	Ransley	Wilson, La.
Dupré	Kreider	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Pa.
Dyer	Lampert	Rhodes	Wood, Ind.
Eagan	Lee, Calif.	Robison, Ky.	Woods, Va.
Edmonds	Lee, Ga.	Rogers	Wright
Elliott	Leibach	Rose	Yates
Esch	Leshner	Rowe	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Farr	Longworth	Schall	

NAYS—60.

Almon	Bell	Buchanan	Curry, Calif.
Aswell	Blanton	Byrnes, Tenn.	Davis, Tenn.
Bankhead	Bowling	Collier	Dickinson, Mo.
Barkley	Rox	Connally	Donthick
Bee	Briggs	Cramton	Eagle

Fairfield	James, Va.	Parrish	Stephens, Miss.
Fields	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Stevenson
Flood	Lanham	Raker	Stoll
Foster	Lankford	Rayburn	Taylor, Ark.
Garrett	Larsen	Ricketts	Tillman
Hoch	McClintic	Romjue	Vinson
Huddleston	McDuffie	Rouse	Welling
Hudspeth	Nicholls	Sherwood	Whaley
Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Sisson	Wingo
Jacoway	Oliver	Steagall	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Crisp

NOT VOTING—163.

Ackerman	Frear	Langley	Reavis
Anderson	Fuller	Layton	Reber
Ayres	Gallagher	Lazaro	Reed, N. Y.
Baer	Gandy	Little	Riddick
Bland, Ind.	Gard	Loneragan	Riordan
Bland, Mo.	Garner	Lufkin	Robinson, N. C.
Boles	Glynn	Luhning	Rodenberg
Bowers	Godwin, N. C.	McAndrews	Rowan
Britten	Goldfogle	McArthur	Rubey
Brooks, Pa.	Goodall	McCulloch	Rucker
Browne	Goodwin, Ark.	McFadden	Sabath
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	McGlennou	Sanders, La.
Burke	Greene, Vt.	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Butler	Hamill	McKinley	Sanford
Caldwell	Hamilton	McPherson	Scully
Candler	Hardy, Tex.	Madden	Sears
Cantrill	Harrel	Maher	Sims
Carew	Harrison	Mann, S. C.	Slemp
Casey	Hays	Mason	Small
Clark	Hill	Merritt	Smith, Mich.
Classon	Hoey	Milligan	Smith, N. Y.
Cole	Howard	Montague	Smithwick
Cooper	Hulings	Moon	Steele
Copley	James, Mich.	Mooney	Steenerson
Costello	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd	Stiness
Crowther	Johnson, Miss.	Murphy	Sullivan
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Neely	Summers, Tex.
Dent	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Mo.	Thomas
Dewalt	Jones, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Dooling	Juul	Nolan	Treadway
Doremus	Kahn	O'Connor	Upshaw
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Olney	Vare
Drewry	Kendall	Overstreet	Venable
Echols	Kennedy, Iowa	Paige	Volstead
Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	Walters
Elston	Kettner	Phelan	Watkins
Emerson	Kiess	Porter	Williams
Evans, Mont.	Kincheloe	Pou	Winslow
Evans, Nev.	Kitchin	Rainey, Ala.	Wise
Ferris	Klecza	Rainey, John W.	Woodyard
Fordney	Knutson	Ramseyer	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. TREADWAY with Mr. GARD.

Mr. BOLES with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. FULLER with Mr. LAZARO.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. LONERAGAN.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. EVANS of Montana.

Mr. BUTLER with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. CAREW.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. SIMS.

Mr. PAIGE with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. MILLIGAN.

Mr. REBER with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. MASON with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. VENABLE.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. NELSON of Missouri.

Mr. FREAR with Mr. DENT.

Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. NOLAN with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. MERRITT with Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. OVERSTREET.

Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. POE.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. SUMMERS of Texas.

Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. LAYTON with Mr. O'CONNOR.

Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. SMITHWICK.

Mr. REED of New York with Mr. HOEY.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GLYNN with Mr. MCGLENNON.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

GOVERNMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

As required by section 21 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1920.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
2d March, 1921.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of rescue work on the Mississippi River.

Mr. RAYBURN. Are these the gentleman's own remarks?

Mr. KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAYBURN. I shall have to object.

Mr. KING. What is the purpose in the gentleman's objecting?

Mr. RAYBURN. Because everybody else's remarks are objected to.

Mr. KING. I wish the gentleman would let me in on that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. RAYBURN) objects.

MINUTES OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record the minutes of the meeting of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. It is less than 300 words in length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the minutes of a recent meeting of the Interparliamentary Union of this body.

Mr. GARRETT. I understand that is an official body.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The minutes are as follows:

The regular annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union was held in the Caucus Room of the House of Representatives at 10 o'clock the morning of February 24, Mr. William B. McKinley, the president, presiding.

The election of the officers for the ensuing year being the order.

The president, William B. McKinley was, on the motion of Mr. Fred Britten, of Illinois, seconded by Mr. Henry Garland Dupré, of Louisiana, unanimously reelected president.

On motion the following members were reelected:

Vice presidents: Andrew J. Montague, Virginia; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; William A. Oldfield, Arkansas.

Mr. Henry Garland Dupré, of Louisiana, was reelected secretary.

Mr. Arthur Deering Call was elected executive secretary for the union.

The following members were unanimously named members of the executive committee: William B. McKinley, Illinois, ex-officio (chairman); Andrew J. Montague, Virginia; Fred Britten, Illinois; Theodore Burton, Ohio; Henry Allen Cooper, Wisconsin; William W. Rucker, Missouri; William A. Oldfield, Arkansas; Joseph T. Robinson, Arkansas; Thomas Sterling, South Dakota; Henry W. Temple, Pennsylvania; Halvor Steenerson, Minnesota; James C. McLaughlin, Michigan.

There were expressions of regret at the continued illness of the efficient executive secretary, Dr. S. N. D. North, who was compelled to retire on account of his state of health, and hope was expressed that he would be speedily restored to his normal condition. On motion the meeting adjourned.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 6 o'clock having arrived, the House stands in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

ABANDONMENT OF FORT DODGE, IOWA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (H. Res. 636) requesting the War Department to furnish information to the Committee on Military Affairs regarding the abandonment of Camp Dodge and pro-

viding that pending the furnishment of such information and action thereon no action toward the wrecking and abandonment of said camp be taken.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The Clerk will report the next one.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15482) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, has it not already been passed?

The SPEAKER. A similar Senate bill has been passed. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15830) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold it.

Mr. SINNOTT. This bill is a bill recommended by the Interdepartmental Bureau for Alaska; that is, the various departments of the Government which deal with Alaskan affairs have recommended the passage of this act. I introduced the bill at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. A similar bill has passed the Senate. At the present time there is no provision in the Alaskan coal laws for a prospecting permit. We have that provision in the general coal act for the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In building the Alaskan Railway and the subsequent acts which have been passed, appropriating very large sums of money, it was then stated that it would be instrumental in producing for the use of the United States on the Pacific coast great quantities of valuable coal, and that the greatest coal deposits known in the history of the world were out in this Territory of Alaska. Now, in the closing hours of Congress comes a bill which, if passed, will be passed without any consideration. We do not know how many Guggenheims there may be in it. We do not know how many Guggenheims there may be who will swallow up that coal in Alaska under the ground by reason of this bill if passed, and my idea was that we might well hesitate and wait until some other term of Congress, when we can give the matter more careful consideration.

Mr. SINNOTT. This bill is a very simple bill. It simply perfects the present law relative to the mining of coal in Alaska. A great deal of the coal that the gentleman refers to is withdrawn by the general coal-leasing act relating to Alaska. This bill merely provides for a prospecting permit, and then if coal is discovered on a prospecting permit one may secure a lease of the land under the provisions of the general coal-leasing law of Alaska.

Mr. BLANTON. What does the Government get out of it?

Mr. SINNOTT. It gets a revenue out of it.

Mr. BLANTON. A royalty of about 2 cents per ton.

Mr. SINNOTT. Whatever royalty the Secretary of the Interior may fix.

Mr. BLANTON. And we have built a railroad up there for prospectors to go out there and get the benefit of this coal?

Mr. SINNOTT. It is a minimum of 2 cents a ton. Then they have to pay 25 cents an acre for the first year and 50 cents for the second, third, fourth, and fifth, and then a dollar a year for every year after the fifth year.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the urgency now?

Mr. MONDELL. Just a moment. When we passed the coal-land leasing act I called attention to the fact that the act was faulty because it had no prospecting provision in it. A man had to go out and lease a tract of land without any opportunity of previously exploring it, and had to locate his claim and develop it, so that he could not tell where he wanted to lease. It was a fault in the bill that they are trying to remedy, in so far as Alaska is concerned. We ought to have the same provision

in the bill as it relates to the United States. It simply provides that in advance of the lease a man will have a prospecting permit, during which time he may prospect the ground and determine the area that he desires to lease. We ought to have had a provision of that kind in the bill for the continental area of the United States. I endeavored to get such a provision placed in the bill when it was passed by the House, but I was unable to do so. There was no reason why it should not have been done, except that the bill we passed was not written that way.

Mr. BLANTON. When was the report made on this bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. The report was made some time ago.

Mr. BLANTON. Several months ago?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; not several months ago.

Mr. BLANTON. It was made in January, was it not?

Mr. SINNOTT. It was reported to the House on January 29.

Mr. BLANTON. And we have waited all of this time, when we have had a good many spare hours, until now we are in the closing hours of the session.

Mr. SINNOTT. No; this bill has waited in its place on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows it is very easy to pass measures in the Senate and bring them over here, when claims involving \$714,000, like the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. claim, can be put on as riders on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Summer is coming on in Alaska, and prospectors will want to be at work. I have discussed this matter with the Delegate elect from Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Interdepartmental Bureau, and they are all in favor of it. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, this bill simply adds to the existing law the exploration rights?

Mr. SINNOTT. The exploration rights, that is all.

Mr. MADDEN. For the period of four years?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. And the man who does the prospecting does it at his own expense?

Mr. SINNOTT. At his own expense.

Mr. MADDEN. And if he discovers coal he may have the right to lease on the terms fixed in the law?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, I have had some experience in this sort of thing. We never can lease coal land in Alaska unless we give the man the right to go on the ground and explore the territory and develop the thickness of the vein, learn the character of the vein, and determine what area he can successfully mine.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman surely heard the speech of the Delegate from Alaska on the coal situation there?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not heard any speech on this subject at all, but I know we ought to have had a provision of this sort in the coal bill when we passed it, and I insisted then that a provision of this kind was essential.

Mr. BLANTON. The coal is not going to get away from us by waiting. It is in the ground.

Mr. SINNOTT. Of course, several months will go by. The Alaskan coal law that will attach to this bill is the coal law that was passed since the so-called frauds took place in Alaska.

Mr. BLANTON. I feel compelled to object.

Mr. SINNOTT. I am sorry the gentleman objects.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oregon to move to suspend the rules.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass S. 4864.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon moves to suspend the rules and pass a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 4864) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding to said section the following proviso:

"And provided further, That where prospecting or exploratory work is necessary to determine the existence or workability of coal deposits in any unclaimed, undeveloped area in Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior may issue prospecting permits for a term of not to exceed four years, under such rules and regulations and conditions as to development as he may prescribe, to applicants qualified under this act, for not to exceed 2,560 acres, and if within the time specified in said permit the permittee shows to the Secretary of the Interior that the land contains coal in commercial quantities, the permittee shall be entitled to a lease under this act for all or any part of the land in his permit.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that this bill needs any further explanation than has already been made, except to say that this is a measure which has been introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, who sent it to Congress on the recommendation of the Interdepartmental Alaskan Board, which is a board made up from the various bureaus that deal with Alaskan affairs. It merely provides for a prospecting permit in Alaska, the same as we incorporated into the coal and oil leasing act.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CURRY of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. CURRY of California. I understood the gentleman to refer to an Interdepartmental Alaskan Board.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. CURRY of California. Can the gentleman cite me to any law creating such a board?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; I am not familiar with any law creating the board. It was created in the departments and consists of a representative of the Secretary of the Interior, a representative of the Secretary of State, a representative of the Secretary of Commerce, and of the various other departments that deal with Alaskan affairs.

Mr. CURRY of California. Do you know of any law authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to create such a board?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; I am not familiar with that; it may be an informal board called together for the purpose of discussing Alaskan affairs.

Mr. CURRY of California. Does not the gentleman think that Congress has permitted the Secretary and the heads of bureaus to exercise powers and functions not authorized by law long enough without our recognizing the right of the Secretary of the Interior to do it when there is no law whatever to create such a board?

Mr. SINNOTT. What I am impressed with is the merits of the recommendation rather than the legality of the creation of the board.

Mr. CURRY of California. As a Member of the House, I would prefer to have the chairman of the committee recognize them as individual citizens and not as occupying official positions.

Mr. SINNOTT. The chairman has recognized the Secretary of the Interior rather than the board.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I notice that the bill provides for the issuing of permits for 2,560 acres; does that mean that one person can get 2,560 acres?

Mr. SINNOTT. No one permit can exceed 2,560 acres. That is the maximum he may take now under the coal laws relating to Alaska. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the present law provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall lease coal lands and the royalty shall be fixed at a certain price per ton. This does not change that law in any respect, except that it goes what the other law should have done, namely, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to issue permits to any person to prospect for coal in Alaska. If by any chance he finds coal, he may then enter into a lease for its production on the permit provided in the existing law. It seems to me the addition to the law that now exists which is provided in this bill is a provision which ought to have gone into the law originally when it passed. There can be no wiser provision than the one sought to be enacted in this law, because it enlists the cooperation of private individuals with their own capital to develop coal in the territory where coal is very much needed. We ought to encourage the activity and initiation of private individuals to the extent that it is possible to encourage it. If there is any other way that such encouragement could be given in addition to that provided in this bill it should be added. I think this covers the case and accomplishes the object.

Mr. KING. Is the issuance of the permit entirely discretionary with the Secretary?

Mr. MADDEN. I should judge so; it should not be discretionary with anybody else. He ought to have the only authority, because the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction over the public lands.

Mr. KING. And he can withhold the permit if he desires?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CROWTHER. Does this apply only to individuals, or can a large corporation go in and prospect for coal?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. How many acres can they take up?

Mr. MADDEN. Two thousand five hundred and sixty acres is the limit that any company or corporation can take.

Mr. CROWTHER. Suppose they divide up into two or three corporations?

Mr. SINNOTT. There are provisions in the law to specifically guard against anything of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are two things which prevent the passage of sane legislation in the House of Representatives. One of these things is the want of intimate knowledge on the part of the membership concerning what the bill contains and its real effect under the law. The other reason that prevents sane legislation from being passed is what we know here on the floor as the courtesy custom among our colleagues. That is, if our friend from Oregon has a certain bill here that is his pet measure, which he wants to pass, he is our friend, we like him, and we want to accommodate him, because, forsooth, he is our friend and we must therefore support his bill. It is those two things which prevent the passage of only the right kind of legislation in this House. This is no time, in the closing hours of Congress, to bring up measures of importance, when the Members have no intimate knowledge whatever of what they contain. Let me call your attention to some of the measures that we have rushed through here in the closing of this Congress. Yesterday there came to us from the other body at the other end of the Capitol an amendment on an appropriation bill which prevented under the former decree of the House, and which, therefore, we had passed, the instruction being sent to the Secretary of War to sell at once 2,000 tractors which the farmers of the country are anxious to have placed on the market. What was the result of that action? If the membership of this House had understood the proposition that amendment of the Senate would have been turned down and that instruction would have been sent to the Secretary of War. For these tractors should be sold. What are the facts in that respect? There are several thousand tractors now in the hands of the Secretary of War which have been deteriorating in value ever since the armistice was signed.

Why have they not been sold? The farmers of the country want them. It is because there has been a secret understanding between the Secretary of War and the manufacturers that he will not flood the market with them. When this House put that proper provision in the bill, providing that those 2,000 tractors should be sold at once, and that bill went to the Senate, a howl was heard from the manufacturers somewhere, and out of that bill by way of Senate amendment that matter was stricken. Yesterday when the matter came up for decision here I forced a roll call upon it, and only four men, I think it was, voted to require those tractors to be sold. If all my colleagues had understood the matter, there would have been no question about the result.

Let me call your attention to other matters which we have hurriedly passed in the closing hours of this Congress. Last week on an appropriation bill, from the Senate, came four different amendments, every one of them voting out large sums of money, being what are known as the Mississippi Valley claims. One of them amounted to \$362,140.98; another to \$204,307.98; another, if I am not mistaken, to nearly \$125,000; and another one to \$15,561.23, if you please—claims of that character coming in as riders on appropriation bills. The distinguished chairman of your Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], got up on the floor and read to those few who were present the statement of the Secretary of War in substance that it would be outrageous to allow those claims and advising not to pass them, and we know that if Congress allowed them it would open up the doors of the Treasury to a billion dollars of such claims now existing. Mr. GOOD tried to keep those claims from passing, and when he forced a record vote upon them, if you will look at the RECORD you will see that there was a minority who voted against them, and they all passed.

Let me call your attention to another one. There has been pending here in the House of Representatives ever since I have been here, for four years, a claim for \$714,007.39, known as the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. claim, for building the Gatun Locks on the Panama Canal.

When I was on the Committee on Claims in the Sixty-fifth Congress, when the manager of that firm was down before the

committee he gave some testimony, and I would like for you to look into the Record and into the minority report which I filed and see his testimony. There is not a man in this House who is unprejudiced who will read that man's testimony who would have voted for that bill. I had the old contract dug up in the Treasury Department. I had an auditor give us a statement, in which he said that in addition to the contract price we had paid the McClintic-Marshall Co. an extra sum of about \$400,000, if I remember correctly, at the end of the contract more than the contract price. They were then coming in here wanting nearly a million dollars more, and because Gen. Goethals, forsooth, recommended the payment of it Congress took the position that it ought to be paid. This is the distinguished Gen. Goethals who during the war wanted this Government to pay several million dollars more for steel than the President thought ought to be paid, and you will remember that the President took him out of that job and put somebody else in his place. The President did not take his judgment of what we should pay for steel.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Texas is not addressing himself to the bill under consideration, and, therefore, he is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has listened to the gentleman, and he has not thought that the gentleman has been discussing the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I am trying to show the Congress that if matters of that kind are considered in the closing hours of Congress we are liable to make mistakes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not hear the gentleman argue. The gentleman must confine himself to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I think I shall confine myself to it. I want you Members to get the Record of a month ago and read the testimony in this case which I then put into the Record at the time I last objected to its consideration.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not complying with the order of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will confine himself to the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to quote concerning such claims as this.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must take his seat when the point of order is made and sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought the Chair sustained me.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair recollects, the rule of the House provides that the gentleman can proceed only by the consent of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. When the point of order is made the Member takes his seat until after it is decided.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will quote the rule, being paragraph 4 of Rule XIV:

If any Member, in speaking or otherwise, transgress the rules of the House, the Speaker shall, or any Member may, call him to order; in which case he shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate.

Mr. BLANTON. After the Chair decides does not the Member resume the floor?

The SPEAKER (reading)—

He shall immediately sit down, unless permitted, on motion of another Member, to explain, and the House shall, if appealed to, decide on the case without debate; if a decision is in favor of the Member called to order, he shall be at liberty to proceed, but not otherwise.

The Chair does not wish, if this is new to the gentleman—

Mr. BLANTON. It is a new rule to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has read from one of the rules of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. That never has been enforced on a Member since I have been here.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the proper motion is to ask that he proceed in order.

Mr. KING. I move that the gentleman proceed in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I ask that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman proceed in order.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and the gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to convince my good friends that this is no time to take up this mining bill, which involves the splendid coal deposits out in Alaska. This House knows how many hundreds of thousands of dollars we have spent for the development of the great Northwest.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman kindly indicate how much coal development there has been in Alaska under the present law during the last six years?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a minute, I will get to that. We have built a railroad out in Alaska that has cost an immense sum of money. We have been told that one of the greatest coal deposits known to geology is out in Alaska, and that when properly developed it will furnish every ton of coal that the Government will need for the Pacific coast.

Mr. McARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment, please. We have heard of the Guggenheims and their grabbing up things in Colorado and other places. Without this bill they can not grab the coal lands in Alaska, but with this bill they can send their expert geologists out there, they can explore that country, and each person who applies, if the Secretary of the Interior desires to give him a permit, can get an exploration permit that covers 2,560 acres of land.

The Guggenheims can send five men out there, each one of them can obtain an exploration permit, and each one of them could cover 2,560 acres of land under an exploration claim for four years, and finally gobble up all the coal. Every bit of these coal deposits might be embraced within those five holdings of 2,560 acres each. Coal deposits are not scattered all over the country broadcast; they are in pockets here and there; and when discovered, men like the Guggenheims can get control and other men and the Government are cut out. How much under this law and this bill would the Government get out of it? A little 2 cents a ton for coal. Two cents a ton. That is about the kind of division that is usually made with the Government. We paid as high as \$15 a ton for coal here in Washington this winter, but the Government is to get 2 cents a ton under the bill and under the law that now exists. Now, if my friend thinks this is a proper time, when everybody's mind is stirred up by many things, when there is not a proper normal equilibrium here in this House, when your minds are on other things—if you think it is a proper time to take up important measures which may mean hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of this country, then go at it, go at it, but I am performing my duty as a Representative in the House of Congress, registering here my feeble protest, and doing it earnestly, honestly, and conscientiously. Now I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho, who has something on his mind.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I desire to inquire of the gentleman if he knows how much coal has been developed in Alaska during the last six years—that is, under the present law—and if he is aware of the fact that that law has not worked well, and this proposed legislation possibly will be helpful in developing the coal resources of Alaska?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH], who seems to be so much interested just now, all of a sudden, in the immediate development of coal in Alaska, has been seated in this House for the last two years, and not a time has he risen in his seat during the two years and said, "Mr. Speaker, we must pass an emergency coal-leasing law for Alaska," but he sits in his seat and waits until we are about to close Congress, when everything is in a stir, when the Capitol is turned upside down, and all the east end of it is turned over to the Ways and Means Committee. Then he comes in all of a sudden and says that if you do not pass this coal-leasing bill, God knows the Government is going to perdition.

Mr. CLARK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not refuse.

Mr. CLARK. Does the gentleman mean, when he says the Capitol is turned upside down, to refer to the controversy he had with his colleague a few days ago, Mr. SUMNERS?

[Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. In due time that matter will be answered. And if the gentleman from Florida had been here, he would have been one man who would have stood up and said, "Mr. Speaker, I am one man for the salary increase." Would you not? Because he is a man who stands for what he stands for.

[Laughter.]

Now, I have used up all the time I want. I have not taken up this time idly. I have not tried to get out of the Record. I have tried to perform my duty in the matter, and if you outvote me, it will not be the first time you have done it.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to consume any time on this or any other bill. It is late in the session. My duties as a Representative in Congress are through. How-

ever, a word may not be out of place on an amendment to a bill that was committed to my charge.

Six years ago the Public Lands Committee, by the aid of the Interior Department, passed for Alaska the best sort of a law it knew how to pass. We did not think it was perfect then, but we did our best. We had no selfish interest to serve. We were engaged in trying to conserve the Nation's resources and develop Alaska. It has not proved to be perfect. Bills are so seldom perfect. It was so tight and so rigid in its terms that the coal men could not make a success under it. It was not sufficiently attractive to them. The transportation question makes it necessary to have the law liberalized. We had hoped to conserve every interest that the Government had, but we really conserved the interest so securely that the coal could not be mined and worked. It is not being worked. That great estate is lying idle. People are moving out of Alaska. A territory rich in resources is not being developed. So true is that that coal had to be shipped from the United States to Alaskan coal consumers. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Payne, has asked the distinguished chairman of the Public Lands Committee [Mr. SINNOTT] to introduce this bill and let the coal men have four years—a permit merely to investigate and ascertain if conditions are feasible for the operation of a coal mine. Large expense is necessary to operate a coal mine in Continental United States, and correspondingly more in remote Alaska, with frigid climate and poor railway facilities.

Investigations must be made. That Territory is remote from the United States. It was necessary to go into it at great length and spend large sums of money. The Secretary asked Chairman SINNOTT to introduce the bill, and he did it. Every member of the Committee on the Public Lands has asked this relief, and the Alaskans asked for it. It only grants a permit of four years, to let the coal operators ascertain whether or not they can work under the law at all. I submit, the Congress ought to do that much for Alaska, that they ought to do that much for the coal field, that they ought to do that much for the coal operators, and that they ought to do that much for the consuming public, who really want to utilize the Alaskan coal. There is no well-founded reason for any furor about this bill. It is proper legislation—not only proper but necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any time I may have remaining. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 181, noes 2.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays, and pending that I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] The Chair has counted a quorum, and without counting all of the Members present.

Two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed.

CENSUS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY.

Mr. SIEGEL and Mr. SINCLAIR rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 251 and pass the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and pass Senate Joint Resolution 251, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 251, to authorize payment to members of the Army and Navy who were employed as enumerators during the Fourteenth Decennial Census to take the census of persons in the Army and Navy.

Whereas it appears that in making an enumeration of persons in the Army and Navy for the Fourteenth Decennial Census, in the judgment of the Director of the Census it was impracticable to do otherwise than, with the official sanction of the Army and Navy, employ officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy as enumerators, and that such officers and enlisted men were duly employed to make the enumeration and were promised compensation at the rate of 3 cents for each person enumerated; and

Whereas the vouchers for such compensation have been disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department on the ground that payment thereof was unwarranted; and

Whereas it further appears that in the judgment of the Director of the Census the census of the military and naval forces was taken more accurately by reason of the assurance of compensation to such enumerators than if it had been taken under orders of the War Department; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the appointment of such enumerators be, and the same is hereby, validated and that the moneys appropriated for the Fourteenth Decennial Census are hereby made available for the payment of their services as such enumerators.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Is the request to consider generally the Senate bills, or just this bill alone?

The SPEAKER. This bill alone.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask, under the reservation of the right to object, whether or not it is the intention of the Chair to recognize bills called from the floor or as they appear upon the printed calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair ruled that we would follow the printed calendar, but this is a bill on the Speaker's table, and the Chair recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL].

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understood the gentleman correctly he said that this was a resolution to pay men in the Army.

Mr. SIEGEL. It is to pay the soldiers and sailors who were asked to take the census while the census was being taken. They were each promised 3 cents a name. They did the work. The money long ago was appropriated, but a question arose as to the propriety of the payment, because they were in the employ of the Army and Navy, and they have not been able to get the money.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. The men were already drawing pay from the Army?

Mr. SIEGEL. This work was done at the request of the Director of the Census.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman tell us how much is involved?

Mr. SIEGEL. Less than \$5,000.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Let me say this to the gentleman from Oklahoma in order that you may have a concrete illustration: At Fort Sam Houston, Tex., there is a considerable population of from 25,000 to 35,000. Those soldiers were detailed by their commanding officers to go through the tedious, long-drawn-out work of census enumerators, under the promise that they would be compensated at the rate of other enumerators.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. My thought was that they were already receiving compensation.

Mr. BEE. They were. This work was done in extra hours.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes. This work was done in extra hours.

Mr. BLANTON. They get this as extra pay?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This extra pay is the same pay that other census enumerators received?

Mr. SIEGEL. Surely.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the census enumerators elsewhere give all their time to this work and receive no pay from anywhere else?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, yes. But many of these enumerators got 4 or 5 cents a name. The soldier boys and sailors were promised 3 cents.

Mr. BLANTON. Supervisors who gave their entire time received less than enough to pay their expenses in some instances.

Mr. SIEGEL. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not a bill pending before the gentleman's committee to pay them extra?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, yes. They want a thousand dollars' bonus.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WINGO. I demand a second.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

FEDERAL BUILDING AND SITE AT GASTONIA, N. C.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 4332, to exchange the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for a new site and building.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 4332. Has the gentleman got a copy of the bill?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to exchange and convey to the Citizens National Bank of Gastonia, N. C., by the usual quitclaim deed, the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for the site at the northwest corner of South Street and West Franklin Street, in said city, offered by said bank, and in addition to said land said bank shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury \$175,000 to cover the cost of the erection of a stone-faced public building thereon adequate and suitable for the needs of the United States in such city. The present Federal building and site to remain in the custody and control of the United States until the completion of the proposed new building.

That upon the said new site, when acquired as aforesaid, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed a suitable and commodious building, with fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, approaches, etc., for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices in said city, at a limit of cost, exclusive of the site, of not exceeding \$175,000, which is hereby appropriated. Said amount being hereby authorized and made available from the moneys to be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury by said Citizens National Bank of Gastonia, N. C., as hereinbefore mentioned.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out the words "which is hereby appropriated."

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this bill the one which provides for the transfer of the present site of the post office at Gastonia to another site in the same city and provides also for the payment by the grantee of the old site of \$175,000 to erect a new post-office building? It seems to be a rather unusual contribution. Has it the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. HOEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen. This bill provides for the exchange of the present post-office site in the town of Gastonia to the Citizens' National Bank, and the Citizens' National Bank submitted to the Government a proposition to give them a new site, because the present building is insufficient, and they would furnish in addition to this new site a sum sufficient to erect a new building, not to exceed \$175,000. The Supervising Architect has recommended it, and the Treasury Department has recommended it. The estimate was not to exceed \$160,000, but in order that there might be no possibility that the Government would incur any expense under it, the bank will put up an amount not exceeding \$175,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How long has this building that is proposed to be sold been erected?

Mr. HOEY. This building was erected in 1916; but the town of Gastonia made the largest percentage of increase in population at the recent census of any town in the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. How much did the building they now have cost?

Mr. HOEY. Sixty-six thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. How much did the ground cost?

Mr. HOEY. Fourteen thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. That makes \$80,000.

Mr. HOEY. Eighty thousand dollars.

Mr. MADDEN. What is proposed to be done?

Mr. HOEY. The Government estimates the value of the site which is to be given to the bank at \$27,000, but the value of it is nearer \$50,000. In addition to that, the bank pays \$175,000 more.

Mr. MADDEN. Why does the bank want to do this?

Mr. HOEY. There are two reasons: One is that the bank likes the present location of the post office, and the other reason is that the present post-office site is so small that no addition can be made to the building.

Mr. MADDEN. How does it happen that only four years after the erection of the building it is suddenly discovered that what they expended \$80,000 on is not what they want?

Mr. HOEY. I started to state that. The town of Gastonia has made a growth of 123 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the population?

Mr. HOEY. Twelve thousand eight hundred and fifty.

Mr. MADDEN. And we propose to put up a building to cost \$175,000 in a town of 12,850 people?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; and the bank pays for every dollar of it.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection? What is the objection to letting the people of this city construct a post-office building, to cost \$175,000 or \$1,175,000, if they furnish the money and there is no expense to the Government? [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. This is my objection to it: In the first place, we put up a building there in 1916 which was presumably fit

for the public needs. Now it is suddenly discovered that that building is not fit for what we put it up for, and it is proposed to sell that building for \$175,000 and a vacant lot.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is proposed to sell the land for what it is worth and have them contribute \$175,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not the proposition.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; it is.

Mr. MADDEN. The proposition is that the bank is going to give them a vacant lot said to be worth \$27,000 and put up a building to cost \$175,000. That is the proposition, if I understand it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if we can sell this building for \$175,000 or \$202,000, as the case may be, why not sell it and put the money into the Treasury?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We could not sell it for \$75,000 except to this bank.

Mr. MADDEN. This town is going to get a new public building, something that no other town in the United States is going to get.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And it will not cost the Government anything.

Mr. MADDEN. The great city of Chicago would like to have a public building.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And if the city of Chicago put up four or five million dollars I think the Government would let us do it.

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. HOEY. I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill as amended. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MADDEN. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOEY. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WALSH. I think when a motion to suspend the rules is made the bill ought to be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it should be again reported as amended. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to exchange and convey to the Citizens National Bank of Gastonia, N. C., by the usual quitclaim deed, the present Federal building and site at Gastonia, N. C., for the site at the northwest corner of South Street and West Franklin Street, in said city, offered by said bank, and in addition to said land said bank shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury \$175,000 to cover the cost of the erection of a stone-faced public building thereon adequate and suitable for the needs of the United States in such city. The present Federal building and site to remain in the custody and control of the United States until the completion of the proposed new building.

That upon the said new site, when acquired as aforesaid, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed a suitable and commodious building, with fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, approaches, etc., for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices in said city, at a limit of cost, exclusive of the site, of not exceeding \$175,000. Said amount being hereby authorized and made available from the moneys to be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury by said Citizens National Bank of Gastonia, N. C., as hereinbefore mentioned.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve my time.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MADDEN. You can get plenty of time to vote. Do not be in a hurry. I do not take up much of the time of the House, and I think this is a question upon which somebody should be heard.

There is in this town down here in North Carolina a public building said to have cost \$80,000 in 1916. Nobody knows how much it is worth to-day. It may be worth \$200,000. Yet we propose to sell it to a bank, and the bank gives us a vacant lot, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] says the vacant lot is worth \$27,000. Nobody knows whether it is worth a cent or not. We have not had any report from any official authority to say what it is worth. Then the gentleman says the bank, in addition to that, is going to put up a building to cost \$175,000. Now, how do we know that? If we are going to sell the property that we own, the money ought to go into the Treasury, and if we are going to erect a new building in this town it ought to be appropriated for in the ordinary way. Now, of course, the gentleman from North Carolina realizes that

he could not get an appropriation for a building in his town, as nobody else in the United States can.

We have not been appropriating money at this session for any public buildings in any city in the United States. The gentleman from North Carolina is smarter than anybody else or some Senator thinks that he has an opportunity to make a trade by which they can get a new public building by indirection when they can not get it directly. I do not propose to stand here and submit to any city in North Carolina or any other city getting by indirection out of the Treasury of the United States that which they would not be able to do by direct appropriation. I know that the leader of the House says that he wants this bill passed; that objection ought not to be made; but if anybody came to him and said that they wanted an appropriation for a building anywhere in the United States he would say, "No, sir; not under any circumstances." The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House have tried day after day to report a public building bill, and there are many cities in the Union that would like a public building—in many cities where they need them—but I apprehend that there is no need of a public building in this place, where we already have an elegant building.

It will not do to say that we are not making an appropriation. We are, where we are disposing of the property that we already own and in which we transact public business. Who can say to-night that this building we own is worth only \$80,000? Who can say that this building we are proposing to get is worth \$175,000? Who can say that it is wise for us to transfer Government property to a bank? Who knows what the bank wants to make the trade for, or how much advantage it will be for the bank and how much disadvantage for the Public Treasury? For myself I unhesitatingly say that it ought not to be done. We have given no study to the question. The Senate passed the bill, it is true, but you can pass a tapeworm through the Senate without any consideration. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. What kind of a building is it proposed to erect, a frame or brick building, and who makes the plans?

Mr. MADDEN. Nobody knows; we have not been told; the bill comes up under a request for unanimous consent, which is refused, and then comes a motion to suspend the rules, and there is no opportunity for amendment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has the gentleman read the report of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Here is the report, containing an answer to every question the gentleman has asked.

Mr. MADDEN. It makes no difference what the Secretary of the Treasury says about it; I say the general policy ought to be if there is going to be a public building it ought to be where it is needed, and not where we already have an adequate public building in which we are doing business. We ought not to sell Government property to accommodate any private individual.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury. An expert went down and made a thorough examination. He passed on the value of the vacant property, of the vacant lot. It was passed in the Senate unanimously. It was submitted to the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and received a unanimous report. There is no suggestion from any quarter that it has not merit, as far as the value is concerned.

I started to say a moment ago that one reason why the present building is inadequate is on account of the marvelous growth that the city has made—123 per cent since the building was erected. There are now over 150 applications for boxes that can not be supplied. The present site is inadequate. The new site is in the civic center of the town, next to the county courthouse. Now, it is provided that the \$175,000 is to be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury in the regular way and the building will be constructed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. MADDEN. And for every dollar that was estimated in 1916, to-day to do the same work, with the same material, would cost \$2.

Mr. HOEY. The estimate was made last year, when material and labor were high, and they estimate that the building would not cost over \$100,000, but in order to be safe the bank offers to pay \$175,000 if necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am on the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that heard this case, and we were satisfied after the hearing that there was nothing wrong in this proposition. I believe it is a

proposition that is safe for the House to pass. I think it went through the committee unanimously.

Mr. MADDEN. But the gentleman must realize that it will cost \$3 to-day to do what every dollar did in 1916.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4664) to amend the first paragraph of section 20 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, as amended by the act of Congress approved April 20, 1920, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the first paragraph of section 20 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, as amended by the act of Congress approved April 20, 1920, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. That bonds provided for in this act shall be issued in denominations of \$40, \$100, \$500, \$1,000, and such larger denominations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may authorize; they shall run for specified minimum and maximum periods, subject to payment and retirement, at the option of the land bank, at any time after the minimum period specified in the bonds, which shall not be longer than 10 years from the date of their issue. They shall have interest coupons attached, payable semiannually, and shall be issued in series of not less than \$50,000, the amount and terms to be fixed by the Federal Farm Loan Board. They shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed 5 per cent per annum."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the consideration of this bill under these circumstances because of the urgent importance of time in the matter. This bill changes the present law in a very slight respect, in one particular. It simply relates to the call period of the bonds of the Federal Farm Loan Association. Under the present law the minimum call period is five years. That is, you understand that if a bond is issued by the Federal Farm Loan Association in which the minimum period is 5 years, the maximum period may be 10, 15, or 20 years, and yet lying back of the specified time in the bond is this law which says that the bond may be called at the end of the 5-year period. Therefore, as a bond on the market, it will be seen that it lessens its value by being subject to call, even though the time may be specified as a longer time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALE. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand the Federal farm loan law, it is all for one and one for all, and if one organization fails, then the organizations under the law as it is must make up the deficit. If all the organizations do not agree to this, if Congress should pass this law, and there should be failures, how about the balance of the organizations? Could it be collected?

Mr. DALE. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill relates only to the call period in the bonds issued by the association. It has no reference to the mortgages of the association, but simply the bonds issued on which the money is raised to loan out on the mortgages.

Mr. CANNON. It has been loaned now and the holders have it, but if Congress enacts a law changing the liability, without the assent—

Mr. DALE. But it does not relate to the liabilities of mortgages at all. It relates simply to the bonds that are issued by the association.

Mr. CANNON. Are not the bonds secured by the land upon which the mortgages are issued?

Mr. DALE. That is true.

Mr. CANNON. I used to be somewhat of a jackleg lawyer, and it seems to me there would be danger that if you did not have the assent of the people who have to pay the loss, that you would release the people from that liability by the law. I make that suggestion.

Mr. DALE. I would suggest to the gentleman that I do not quite see how this affects the liability in any particular. It does not affect the liability of the farmer who gives the mortgage in any way. It is the association that issues the bond on which the money is raised and loaned to the farmer.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. DALE. This bill simply changes the present law in this particular. While the call period at the present time under the present law is limited to 5 years, this bill extends the time

to 10 years, so that the Federal Farm Loan Association can issue bonds the call period of which may be 10 years instead of 5.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I am much in sympathy with the gentleman's position. As I understand it in the bonds that you propose to sell now the call period will be extended from 5 to 10 years, thereby making them much more attractive to buyers.

Mr. DALE. Precisely; that is the purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Thereby enabling the farmer to raise money with which to carry on his crops?

Mr. DALE. It would seem to me that the law as amended by this bill if enacted into law would lessen the liability—

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Why, surely.

Mr. DALE. Of the farmer rather than increase it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALE. I will.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The gentleman feels certain that they will be able to sell these bonds?

Mr. DALE. That is one reason why this bill is asked for. It is one purpose of getting this into the law. Of course, you gentlemen know the difficulty the Federal Farm Loan Association has had in selling its bonds. You know what has had to be done. Things have had to be done here in the House you and I felt were out of line with our best judgment; but we had to do that when ordinarily we would not give our approval, because we had to get the funds for this association for the reason that these bonds were not salable; that is, they were not very attractive on the market, but we had to get funds for the association. Now, the purpose of this law is to make them more attractive.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Has the gentleman considered the proposition of increasing the rate of interest?

Mr. DALE. Yes; but that is objected to immediately. The minute you talk about raising the rate of interest above 5 per cent on the loans to the farmers you know what goes up all over the country. They say, why we can not do that.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They would rather have the loans than no money.

Mr. DALE. There is a lot more I would like to say, but I have some one who can tell you much more about this, and I want to yield to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Just this question: Now, if the gentleman's bill passes it will enable these farmers to raise money through this association, and if it does not pass there is danger of these men having to pay more for money they would borrow?

Mr. DALE. It would result in just what the gentleman from Minnesota indicated. The only relief that you can get under this condition is to raise the rate of interest from 5 to 5½ or 6 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Increasing the call term to 10 years will make the bonds more attractive?

Mr. DALE. All of which makes them so much more attractive.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. And facilitates the sale of bonds.

Mr. RANDALL of California. What effect will making the farm-loan bonds attractive have on the Liberty bonds?

Mr. DALE. There will not be any.

Mr. RANDALL of California. If the bond buyers are attracted by the farm-loan bonds, they will not want to buy Liberty bonds?

Mr. DALE. Yes; but the gentleman will remember that we had to take care of \$200,000,000 of these bonds when we were selling Liberty bonds. We had to do it.

Mr. RANDALL of California. Will the Liberty bonds be worth more or less under this provision?

Mr. DALE. I do not think it makes any difference. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this bill is to increase the optional period of the Federal farm loan bonds from 5 years to 10 years. This will increase the attractiveness of the bonds to the purchaser and will enable the board to offer the bonds at a decreased rate of interest, and to that particular proposition I will address my remarks. At the present time bonds are limited to five years' optional period before they can be called. Now, a bond bearing 5 per cent interest on its face and offered on a basis to earn 4½ per cent for five years would be worth 102.22. That is, a \$1,000 bond would be worth \$1,022.20.

But if the optional period were increased to 10 years, that same bond would be worth \$1,039.90, or \$17.70 more—be worth that much more to the sellers of the bond; that is, to the farmers of the country—and that would effect in itself the reduction of about a quarter of a cent per year in the interest rate. If the bond buyers were willing to accept 4½ per cent interest on their investment, the \$1,000 bond would be worth \$1,033.50 for a five-year period, but if the optional period were increased to 10 years it would be worth \$1,080.60, or, the bond would be worth to the seller \$27.10 more than it is now. This would decrease the interest rate about one-third of 1 per cent. But, if the bond buyer who was willing to earn 4 per cent on his investment, which is a fair rate of return on tax-exempt securities of first-class character, the bond would be worth \$1,044.90 for the five-year period; but if we pass this bill and increase the optional period to 10 years the bond would be worth \$1,081.80, or \$36.90 more to the seller, which would effect a reduction in the interest rate of nearly one-half of 1 per cent. So that by increasing the time from 5 to 10 years we increase the attractiveness of the bond to the purchaser and at the same time decrease the interest rate to the farmers who have to pay it.

The investment demand is always for long-term securities; that is, for a long term before the optional period expires. Purchasers desire in investing their money to obtain securities that will run for a considerable period of time.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. How will that affect the bonds already issued?

Mr. HAWLEY. It will not affect them at all in my opinion. We do not propose to invalidate the obligation of any contract now outstanding. The legislation proposed relates only to future issues. There has been a general demand for the increase in the length of the optional period.

I have some knowledge of associations that would buy these bonds who do not care to buy a bond which may be called at the end of five years, because the time is so short in which to realize the amortization of any premium paid—and these bonds have been sold in times past at some premium—that it puts an element of speculation in the purchase that buyers of bonds for investment purposes do not care to assume. But if we increase the rate to 10 years, then we open the market for these bonds to a very much larger body of purchasers, who will buy them in considerable quantities if the time before they can be called for payment is extended.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will not the effect of this be to depreciate the value of outstanding issues?

Mr. HAWLEY. Not necessarily, because the outstanding issues, most of them, have run for a considerable portion of the five-year period, and the investors who will receive their money for those bonds when called will be very glad to have an opportunity to reinvest that money in the longer-term bonds. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that this bill does is to amend the present law in one simple particular. On April 20, 1920, we changed section 20 of the act with reference to bonds, but we did not change the 5-year optional period. I will read section 20 as the present law exists, and read what we propose to substitute for it. Section 20 reads:

SEC. 20. That bonds provided for in this act shall be issued in denominations of \$40, \$100, \$500, \$1,000, and such larger denominations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may authorize; they shall run for specified minimum and maximum periods, subject to payment and retirement, at the option of the land bank, at any time after five years from the date of their issue. They shall have interest coupons attached, payable semiannually, and shall be issued in series of not less than \$50,000, the amount and terms to be fixed by the Federal Farm Loan Board. They shall bear a rate of interest not to exceed 5 per cent per annum.

Now, the language that we propose in the pending bill is the same, until it gets down to the question of the optional period, and it reads as follows:

Subject to payment and retirement, at the option of the land bank, at any time after the minimum period specified in the bonds, which shall not be longer than 10 years from the date of their issue.

In other words, under the present existing law, if the Farm Loan Board issues a 20-year farm loan bond, the investor who desires to buy that bond has no assurance he is buying a permanent investment—that is, a 20-year investment—because under the law there is an option of retirement at the end of five years. Now, that has had a tendency to depreciate the market value in some instances on farm loan bonds. Now, we propose

in this act to make it possible for the board to fix the minimum option period 10 years instead of 5. While we give the right, if they want it, to have it 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and up to 10, the latter is the maximum optional minimum period, and permits them to make it 10 years, and that is what we have intended to do in future years, namely, to have the 10-year optional retirement privilege.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. If a purchaser has at this time bonds of the Federal Farm Loan Board, when these new bonds are issued, with the preferred bonds, preferred because there is a longer callable period, do you not necessarily depreciate his existing bonds?

Mr. WINGO. Of course, theoretically you do.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. If you buy them and wanted to sell them, you would have to sell them in competition with this new bond of a preferred class, would you not?

Mr. WINGO. Has the gentleman in his mind the idea that anybody having these farm-loan bonds would be willing to sell them now?

Mr. WHITE of Maine. They would be hurt if they were to sell them for less than they paid for them.

Mr. WINGO. Yes. Let me tell the gentleman what the facts are: Bids were made on the market the day before the Supreme Court decision was announced in the case at 95, I believe, and no bonds sold for that. Yesterday 95½, as I recall, was bid, and no bonds were sold. Anyone who has those bonds now who sells them for less than par ought to have a guardian appointed for him, because he does not know what property is worth.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Many of the bonds were bought at less than par.

Mr. WINGO. I can not follow the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. You have a bond that you have paid for at par. It is callable in five years.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman must know that there is a distinction between these bonds and bonds issued under an iron-clad, rigid rule, which a man has bought with his eyes wide open, for what they are worth. In this case you know that nobody, in fact, is going to suffer. Of course, theoretically, if you put out a more preferable bond, in theory it ought to bring a higher price than the other. But the fact is you can not buy farm-loan bonds on the market to-day. For illustration, to show that I know what I am talking about instead of guessing, I will say that a friend of mine to-day wanted to invest in those bonds, and he could not find them at par. They are gilt edge now, since decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WINGO. Let me finish this. It has been stressed that these bonds would be more attractive to investors if they were put at 10 years. The main purpose here is to so provide that the business of the board and the business of the banks can be handled in a more businesslike way. That can be done better if they are handled in 10-year periods than if they are handled in periods of five years. I do not think the situation is as serious as some think. They think they ought to make them as attractive as possible. I know they could issue more on the same terms as the bonds now outstanding, and they could sell them overnight. But with a minimum period fixed, they can make the financial arrangements and the sinking fund and other requirements for the 10-year period at less expense and with less trouble than for a 5-year period.

I shall take the liberty of inserting in the RECORD the decision of the Supreme Court holding the farm loan act constitutional.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 199, October term, 1920. Charles E. Smith, appellant, v. Kansas City Title & Trust Co. et al., appellees. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.]

(Feb. 28, 1921.)

Mr. Justice Day delivered the opinion of the court.

A bill was filed in the United States District Court for the western division of the Western District of Missouri by a shareholder in the Kansas City Title & Trust Co. to enjoin the company, its officers, agents, and employees from investing the funds of the company in farm-loan bonds issued by Federal land banks or joint stock land banks under authority of the Federal farm loan act of July 17, 1916 (39 Stat., 360), as amended January 18, 1918 (40 Stat., 431).

The relief was sought on the ground that these acts were beyond the constitutional power of Congress. The bill avers that the board of directors of the company are about to invest its funds in the bonds to the amount of \$10,000 in each of the classes described, and will do so unless enjoined by the court in this action. The bill avers the formation of 12 Federal land banks and 21 joint stock land banks under the provisions of the act.

As to the Federal land banks, it is averred that each of them has loaned upon farm lands large amounts secured by mortgage, and after depositing the same with the farm loan registrar has executed and issued collateral trust obligations called farm loan bonds, secured by the depositing of an equivalent amount of farm mortgages and notes;

and that each of said Federal land banks has sold and is continuing to offer for sale large amounts of said farm loan bonds. The bill also avers that various persons in different parts of the United States have organized 21 joint-stock land banks, the capital stock of which is subscribed for and owned by private persons; that the joint-stock land banks have deposited notes and mortgages with the farm loan registrar, and issued an equivalent amount of collateral trust obligations called farm loan bonds, which have been sold and will be continued to be offered for sale to investors in large amounts in the markets of the country. A statement is given of the amount of deposits by the Secretary of the Treasury with the Federal land banks, for which the banks have issued their certificates of indebtedness bearing interest at 2 per cent per annum. It is averred that on September 30, 1919, Federal land banks owned United States bonds of the par value of \$4,230,805; and the joint-stock land banks owned like bonds of the par value of \$3,287,503 on August 31, 1919; that pursuant to the provisions of the act the Secretary of the Treasury has invested \$8,892,130 of the public funds in the capital stock of the Federal land banks, and that on July 1, 1919, the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States held \$8,265,809 of the capital stock of the Federal land banks; that pursuant to the provisions of section 32 of the act, as amended, the Secretary of the Treasury has purchased farm loan bonds issued by the Federal land banks of the par value of \$149,775,000; that up to September 30, 1919, bonds have been issued under the act by the Federal land banks to the amount of \$285,600,000, of which about \$135,000,000 are held in the Treasury of the United States, purchased under the authority of the amendment of January 19, 1918; that up to September 30, 1919, 27 joint-stock land banks have been incorporated under the act, having an aggregate capital of \$8,000,000, all of which has been subscribed and \$7,450,000 paid in; that bonds have been issued by joint-stock land banks to the amount of \$41,000,000, which are now in the hands of the public; that the Secretary of the Treasury up to the time of the filing of the bill has not designated any of the Federal land banks nor the joint-stock land banks as depositories of public money, nor except as stated later in the bill has he employed them or any of them as financial agents of the Government, nor have they or any of them performed any duties as depositories of public money, nor have they or any of them accepted any deposits or engaged in any banking business. The bill avers that during the summer of 1918 the Federal land banks at Wichita, St. Paul, and Spokane were designated as financial agents of the Government for making seed-grain loans to farmers in drought-stricken sections, the President having at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture set aside \$5,000,000 for that purpose out of the \$100,000,000 war funds. The three banks mentioned made upward of 15,000 loans of that character, aggregating a sum upward of \$4,500,000, and are now engaged in collecting these loans, all of which are secured by crop liens; that these banks act in that capacity without compensation, receiving only the actual expenses incurred.

Section 27 of the act provides that farm-loan bonds issued under the provisions of the act by Federal land banks or joint-stock land banks shall be a lawful investment for all fiduciary and trust funds and may be accepted as security for all public deposits. The bill avers that the defendant trust company is authorized to buy, invest in, and sell Government, State, and municipal and other bonds, but it can not buy, invest in, or sell any such bonds, papers, stocks, or securities which are not authorized to be issued by a valid law or which are not investment securities, but that nevertheless it is about to invest in farm-loan bonds; that the trust company has been induced to direct its officers to make the investment by reason of its reliance upon the provisions of the farm loan acts, especially sections 21, 26, and 27, by which the farm-loan bonds are declared to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, and as such with the income derived therefrom, are declared to be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation, and are further declared to be lawful investments for all fiduciary and trust funds. The bill further avers that the acts by which it is attempted to authorize the bonds are wholly illegal, void, and unconstitutional and of no effect because unauthorized by the Constitution of the United States.

The bill prays that the acts of Congress authorizing the creation of the banks, especially sections 26 and 27 thereof, shall be adjudged and decreed to be unconstitutional, void, and of no effect, and that the issuance of the farm-loan bonds, and the taxation exemption feature thereof, shall be adjudged and decreed to be invalid.

The first joint-stock land bank of Chicago and the Federal land bank of Wichita, Kans., were allowed to intervene and became parties defendant to the suit. The Kansas City Title & Trust Co. filed a motion to dismiss in the nature of a general demurrer, and upon hearing the district court entered a decree dismissing the bill, from this decree appeal was taken to this court.

No objection is made to the Federal jurisdiction, either original or appellate, by the parties to this suit, but that question will be first examined. The company is authorized to invest its funds in legal securities only. The attack upon the proposed investment in the bonds described is because of the alleged unconstitutionality of the act of Congress undertaking to organize the banks and authorize the issue of the bonds. No other reason is set forth in the bill as a ground of objection to the proposed investment by the board of directors acting in the company's behalf. As diversity of citizenship is lacking, the jurisdiction of the district court depends upon whether the cause of action set forth arises under the Constitution or laws of the United States. (Judicial Code, sec. 24.)

The general rule is that where it appears from the bill or statement of the plaintiff that the right to relief depends upon the construction or application of the Constitution or laws of the United States, and that such Federal claim is not merely colorable, and rests upon a reasonable foundation, the district court has jurisdiction under this provision.

At an early date, considering the grant of constitutional power to confer jurisdiction upon the Federal courts, Chief Justice Marshall said:

"A case in law or equity consists of the right of the one party, as well as of the other, and may truly be said to arise under the Constitution or a law of the United States whenever its correct decision depends upon the construction of either." (Cohens v. Virginia, 6 Wheat. 264, 379); and again, when "the right or title set up by the party may be defeated by one construction of the Constitution or law of the United States, and sustained by the opposite construction." (Osborn v. Bank of the United States, 9 Wheat. 738, 822. These definitions were quoted and approved in Patton v. Brady, 184 U. S., 608, 611, citing Gold Washing Co. v. Keyes, 96 U. S., 199, 201; Tennessee v. Davis,

100 U. S., 257; *White v. Greenhow*, 114 U. S., 307; *Railroad Co. v. Mississippi*, 102 U. S., 135, 139.)

This characterization of a suit arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States has been followed in many decisions of this and other Federal courts. See *Macon Grocery Co. v. Atlantic Coast Line* (215 U. S., 501, 506, 507); *Shulthis v. McDougal* (225 U. S., 569, sec. 3). The principle was applied in *Brushaber v. Union Pacific Co.* (240 U. S., 1), in which a shareholder filed a bill to enjoin the defendant corporation from complying with the income-tax provisions of the tariff act of October 3, 1913. In that case, while there was diversity of citizenship, a direct appeal to this court was sustained because of the constitutional questions raised in the bill, which had been dismissed by the court below. The repugnancy of the statute to the Constitution of the United States, as well as grounds of equitable jurisdiction, were set forth in the bill, and the right to come here on direct appeal was sustained because of the averments based upon constitutional objections to the act. Reference was made to *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S., 429), where a similar shareholder's right to sue was maintained, and a direct appeal to this court from a decree of the circuit court was held to be authorized.

In the *Brushaber* case the Chief Justice, speaking for the court, said: "The right to prevent the corporation from returning and paying the tax was based upon many averments as to the repugnancy of the statute to the Constitution of the United States, of the peculiar relation of the corporation to the stockholders and their particular interests resulting from many of the administrative provisions of the assailed act, of the confusion, wrong and multiplicity of suits, and the absence of all means of redress which would result if the corporation paid the tax and complied with the act in other respects without protest, as it was alleged it was its intention to do. To put out of the way a question of jurisdiction, we at once say that in view of these averments and the ruling in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S., 429) sustaining the right of a stockholder to sue to restrain a corporation under proper averments from voluntarily paying a tax charged to be unconstitutional on the ground that to permit such a suit did not violate the prohibitions of section 3224, Revised Statutes, against enjoining the enforcement of taxes, we are of opinion that the contention here made that there was no jurisdiction of the cause since to entertain it would violate the provisions of the Revised Statutes referred to is without merit."

"Aside from averments as to citizenship and residence, recitals as to the provisions of the statute and statements as to the business of the corporation contained in the first 10 paragraphs of the bill advanced to sustain jurisdiction, the bill alleged 21 constitutional objections, specified in that number of paragraphs or subdivisions. As all the grounds assert a violation of the Constitution, it follows that in a wide sense they all charge a repugnancy of the statute to the sixteenth amendment under the more immediate sanction of which the statute was adopted."

The jurisdiction of this court is to be determined upon the principles laid down in the cases referred to. In the instant case the averments of the bill show that the directors were proceeding to make the investments in view of the act authorizing the bonds about to be purchased, maintaining that the act authorizing them was constitutional and the bonds valid and desirable investments. The objecting shareholder avers in the bill that the securities were issued under an unconstitutional law, and hence of no validity. It is therefore apparent that the controversy concerns the constitutional validity of an act of Congress which is directly drawn in question. The decision depends upon the determination of this issue.

The general allegations as to the interest of the shareholder, and his right to have an injunction to prevent the purchase of the alleged unconstitutional securities by misapplication of the funds of the corporation, gives jurisdiction under the principles settled in *Pollock v. Trust Co.*, and *Brushaber v. Union Pacific Co.*, supra. We are therefore of the opinion that the district court had jurisdiction under the averments of the bill and that a direct appeal to this court upon constitutional grounds is authorized.

We come to examine the questions presented by the attack upon the constitutionality of the legislation in question. The Federal farm loan act is too lengthy to set out in full. It is entitled:

"An act to provide capital for agricultural development, to create standard forms of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to create Government depositories and financial agents for the United States, and for other purposes."

The administration of the act is placed under the direction and control of a Federal Farm Loan Bureau established at the seat of government in the Treasury Department, under the general supervision of the Federal Loan Board, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury and four members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The United States is divided into 12 districts for the purpose of establishing Federal land banks. Each of the banks must have a subscribed capital of not less than \$750,000, divided into shares of \$5 each, which may be subscribed for by any individual, firm, or corporation, or by the government of any State or of the United States. No dividend shall be paid on the stock owned by the United States, but all other stock shall share in dividend distributions without preference. The Federal Farm Loan Board is to designate five directors who shall temporarily manage the affairs of each Federal land bank, and who shall prepare an organization certificate which, when approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board and filed with the Farm Loan Commissioner, shall open to create the bank a body corporate. The Federal Farm Loan Board is required to open books of subscription for the capital stock of each Federal land bank, and if within 30 days thereafter any part of the minimum capitalization of \$750,000 of any such bank shall remain unsubscribed, it is made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe the balance on behalf of the United States.

The amendment of January 18, 1918, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase bonds issued by Federal land banks, and provides that the temporary organization of any such bank shall be continued so long as any farm loan bonds shall be held by the Treasury, and until the subscription to stock in such bank by national farm loan associations shall equal the amount of the stock held by the United States Government. When these conditions are complied with a permanent organization is to take over the management of the bank, consisting of a board of directors composed of nine members, three of whom shall be known as district directors and shall be appointed by the Farm Loan Board, who shall represent the public interest, six of whom to be known as local directors, shall be chosen by and be representative of the national farm loan associations.

Federal land banks are empowered to invest their funds in the purchase of qualified first mortgages on farm lands situated within the

Federal land bank district within which they are organized or acting. Loans on farm mortgages are to be made to cooperative borrowers through the organization of corporations known as national farm loan associations, by persons desiring to borrow money on farm-mortgage security under the terms of the act. Ten or more natural persons who are the owners of or are about to become the owners of farm land qualified as security for mortgage loans, and who desire to borrow money on farm-mortgage security, may unite to form a national farm loan association. The manner of forming these associations and the qualifications for membership are set out in the act.

A loan desired by each such person must be for not more than \$10,000 nor less than \$100, and the aggregate of the desired loans not less than \$20,000. The application for loan must be accompanied by subscriptions to stock of a Federal land bank equal to 5 per cent of the aggregate sum desired on the mortgage loan. Provision is made for appraisal of the land and report to the Federal Farm Loan Board. No persons but borrowers on farm loan mortgages shall be members or shareholders of national farm loan associations.

Shareholders in farm loan associations are made individually responsible for the debts of the association to the extent of the amount of the stock owned by them, respectively, in addition to the amount paid in and represented by their shares.

When any national farm loan association shall desire to secure for any member a loan on first mortgage from the Federal land bank in its district it must subscribe to the capital stock of the Federal land bank to an amount of 5 per cent of such loan, which capital stock shall be held by the Federal land bank as collateral security for the payment of the loan; the association shall be paid any dividends accruing and payable on the capital stock while it is outstanding. Such stock may, in the discretion of the directors and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, be paid off at par and retired, and shall be so retired upon the full payment of the mortgage loan. In such event the national farm loan association must pay off at par and retire the corresponding shares of its stock which were issued when the land bank stock so retired was issued; but it is further provided that the capital stock of the land bank shall not be reduced to less than 5 per cent of the principal of the outstanding farm loan bonds issued by it. The shares in national farm loan associations shall be of the par value of \$5 each.

At least 25 per cent of that part of the capital of any Federal land bank for which stock is outstanding in the name of National Farm Loan Associations must be held in quick assets. Not less than 5 per cent of such capital must be invested in United States Government bonds.

The loans which Federal land banks may make upon first mortgages on farm lands are provided for in section 12 of the act. By section 13 these banks are empowered, subject to the provisions of the act, to issue and sell farm loan bonds of the kind described in the act and to invest funds in their possession in qualified first mortgages on farm lands, to receive and to deposit in trust with the farm loan registrar, to be held by him as collateral security for farm loan bonds, first mortgages upon farm lands, and, with the approval of the Farm Loan Board, to issue and to sell their bonds secured by the deposit of first mortgages on qualified farm lands as collateral, in conformity with the provisions of section 18 of the act. By the amendment of January 18, 1918, the Secretary of the Treasury was empowered during the years 1918 and 1919 to purchase farm loan bonds issued by Federal land banks to an amount not exceeding \$100,000,000 each year, and any Federal land bank was authorized at any time to repurchase at par and accrued interest, for the purpose of redemption or resale, any of the bonds so purchased from it and held in the United States Treasury.

It is also provided that the bonds of any Federal land bank so purchased and held in the Treasury one year after the termination of the pending war shall, upon 30 days' notice from the Secretary of the Treasury, be redeemed and repurchased by such bank at par and accrued interest. By section 15 it is provided that whenever, after the act shall have been in effect for one year, it shall appear to the Federal Farm Loan Board that national farm loan associations have not been formed and are not likely to be formed in any locality because of peculiar local conditions, the board may, in its discretion, authorize Federal land banks to make loans on farm lands through agents approved by the board on the terms and conditions and subject to the restrictions prescribed in that section.

The act also authorizes the incorporation of joint-stock land banks, with capital provided by private subscription. They are organized by not less than 10 natural persons, and are subject to the requirements of the provisions of section 4 of the act so far as applicable. The board of directors shall consist of not less than five members. Each shareholder shall have the same voting privileges as the holders of shares in national banking associations, and shall be held individually responsible, equally and ratably, and not one for another, for all contracts, debts, and engagements of such bank to the extent of the amount of stock owned by them at the par value thereof, in addition to the amount paid in and represented by their shares. The joint-stock land bank is authorized to do business when capital stock to the amount of \$250,000 has been subscribed, and one-half paid in cash, the balance remaining subject to call by the board of directors, the charter to be issued by the Federal Farm Loan Board. No bonds shall be issued until the capital stock is entirely paid up. Except as otherwise provided, joint-stock land banks shall have the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions and conditions imposed on Federal land banks by the act, so far as such conditions or restrictions are applicable.

Federal land banks may issue farm loan bonds up to twenty times their capital and surplus. Joint-stock land banks are limited to the issue of farm loan bonds not in excess of fifteen times the amount of their capital and surplus. Joint-stock land banks can only loan on first mortgages upon land in the State where located, or in a State contiguous thereto. No loan on mortgage may be made by any bank at a rate exceeding 6 per cent per annum exclusive of amortization payments. Joint-stock land banks shall in no case charge a rate of interest on farm loans which shall exceed by more than 1 per cent the rate established by the last series of farm loan bonds issued by them, which rate shall not exceed 5 per cent per annum.

Provisions for the issue of farm loan bonds secured by first mortgages on farm lands or United States bonds, as collateral, which must be deposited with the Federal Farm Loan registrar, are made for Federal land banks and joint-stock land banks; in each case the issue is made subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board. The farm loan mortgages, or United States bonds, which constitute the collateral security for the bonds, must be deposited with the Farm Loan Commissioner.

Section 26 of the act provides as follows:

"That every Federal land bank and every national farm loan association, including the capital and reserve or surplus therein and the income derived therefrom, shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal,

and local taxation, except taxes upon real estate held, purchased, or taken by said bank or association under the provisions of section 11 and section 13 of this act. First mortgages executed to Federal land banks or to joint-stock land banks and farm loan bonds issued under the provisions of this act shall be deemed and held to be instrumentalities of the Government of the United States, and as such they and the income derived therefrom shall be exempt from Federal, State, municipal, and local taxation.

"Nothing herein shall prevent the shares in any joint-stock land bank from being included in the valuation of the personal property of the owner or holder of such shares in assessing taxes imposed by authority of the State within which the bank is located, but such assessment and taxation shall be in manner and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in section 5219 of the Revised Statutes with reference to the shares of national banking associations.

"Nothing herein shall be construed to exempt the real property of Federal and joint-stock land banks and national farm loan associations from either State, county, or municipal taxes to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed."

Since the decision of the great cases of *McCulloch v. Maryland* (4 Wheat., 316) and *Osborn v. Bank* (9 Wheat., 738), it is no longer an open question that Congress may establish banks for national purposes, only a small part of the capital of which is held by the Government, and a majority of the ownership in which is represented by shares of capital stock privately owned and held, the principal business of such banks being private banking conducted with the usual methods of such business. While the express power to create a bank or incorporate one is not found in the Constitution, the court, speaking by Chief Justice Marshall, in *McCulloch v. Maryland*, found authority so to do in the broad general powers conferred by the Constitution upon the Congress to levy and collect taxes, to borrow money, to regulate commerce, to pay the public debts, to declare and conduct war, to raise and support armies, and to provide and maintain a navy, etc. Congress, it was held, had authority to use such means as were deemed appropriate to exercise the great powers of the Government by virtue of Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution, granting to Congress the right to make all laws necessary and proper to make the grant effectual. In *First National Bank v. Union Trust Co.* (244 U. S., 413, 419), the Chief Justice, speaking for the court, after reviewing *McCulloch v. Maryland* and *Osborn v. Bank*, and considering the power given to Congress to pass laws to make the specific powers granted effectual, said:

"In terms it was pointed out that this broad authority was not stereotyped as of any particular time, but endured, thus furnishing a perpetual and living sanction to the legislative authority within the limits of a just discretion, enabling it to take into consideration the changing wants and demands of society and to adopt provisions appropriate to meet every situation which it was deemed required to be provided for."

That the formation of the bank was required, in the judgment of the Congress for the fiscal operations of the Government, was a principal consideration upon which Chief Justice Marshall rested the authority to create the bank; and for that purpose being an appropriate measure, in the judgment of the Congress, it was held not to be within the authority of the court to question the conclusion reached by the legislative branch of the Government.

Upon the authority of *McCulloch v. Maryland* and *Osborn v. Bank* the national banking system was established, and upon them this court has rested the constitutionality of the legislation establishing such banks. (*Farmers & Mechanics National Bank v. Deering*, 91 U. S. 29, 33, 54.)

Congress has seen fit in section 6 of the act to make both classes of banks, when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, depositaries of public money, except receipts from customs, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and has authorized their employment as financial agents of the Government, and the banks are required to perform such reasonable duties, as depositaries of public moneys and financial agents as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require of the Federal land banks and the joint-stock land banks, thus designated, satisfactory security, by the deposit of United States bonds or otherwise, for the safekeeping and prompt payment of the public money deposited with them, and for the faithful performance of their duties as the financial agents of the Government.

Section 6 also provides that no Government funds deposited under the provisions of the section shall be invested in mortgage loans or farm loan bonds.

It is said that the power to designate these banks as such depositaries has not been exercised by the Government, and that the Federal land banks have acted as Federal agents only in the case of loans of money for seed purposes made in the summer of 1915, to which we have already referred. But the existence of the power under the Constitution is not determined by the extent of the exercise of the authority conferred under it. Congress declared it necessary to create these fiscal agencies, and to make them authorized depositaries of public money. Its power to do so is no longer open to question.

But, it is urged, the attempt to create these Federal agencies, and to make these banks fiscal agents and public depositaries of the Government, is but a pretext. But nothing is better settled by the decisions of this court than that when Congress acts within the limits of its constitutional authority, it is not the province of the judicial branch of the Government to question its motives. (*Yazoo Bank v. Feno*, 8 Wall., 523, 541; *McCray v. United States*, 195 U. S. 27; *Flint v. Stone-Trimby Co.*, 220 U. S. 107, 147, 153, 156; and cases cited.)

That Congress has seen fit to make of these banks fiscal agencies and depositaries of public moneys, and also to grant to them banking powers of a limited character, in no wise detracts from the authority of Congress to use them for the governmental purposes named, if it sees fit to do so. A bank may be organized with or without the authority to issue currency. It may be authorized to receive deposits in only a limited way. Speaking generally, a bank is a moneyed institution to facilitate the borrowing, lending, and caring for money. But whether technically banks, or not, these organizations may serve the governmental purposes declared by Congress in their creation. Furthermore, these institutions are organized to serve as a market for United States bonds. Not less than 5 per cent of the capital of the Federal land banks, for which stock is outstanding in farm loan associations, is required to be invested in United States bonds. Both kinds of banks are empowered to buy and sell United States bonds.

In *First National Bank v. Trust Company* (244 U. S., supra), this court sustained the power of Congress to enable a national bank to transact business which, by itself considered, might be beyond the power of

Congress to authorize. In that case it was held to be within the authority of Congress to permit national banks to exercise, by permission of the Federal Reserve Board, when not in contravention of local law, the office of trustee, executor, administrator, or registrar of stocks or bonds.

We therefore conclude that the creation of these banks and the grant of authority to them to act for the Government as depositaries of public moneys and purchasers of Government bonds brings them within the creative power of Congress, although they may be intended, in connection with other privileges and duties, to facilitate the making of loans upon farm security at low rates of interest. This does not destroy the validity of these enactments any more than the general banking powers destroyed the authority of Congress to create the United States Bank, or the authority given to national banks to carry on additional activities destroyed the authority of Congress to create these institutions.

In the brief filed upon reargument counsel for the appellant seem to admit the power of Congress to appropriate money for the direct purposes named, and in that brief they say: "Tax exemption is the real issue sought to be settled here." Deciding as we do, that these institutions have been created by Congress within the exercise of its legitimate authority, we think the power to make the securities here involved tax exempt necessarily follows. This principle was settled in *McCulloch v. Maryland* and *Osborn v. Bank*, supra.

That the Federal Government can, if it sees fit to do so, exempt such securities from taxation seems obvious upon the clearest principles. But it is said to be an invasion of State authority to extend the tax exemption so as to restrain the power of the State. Of a similar contention made in *McCulloch v. Maryland* Chief Justice Marshall uttered his often-quoted statement:

"That the power to tax involves the power to destroy; that the power to destroy may defeat and render useless the power to create; that there is a plain repugnance in conferring on one government a power to control the constitutional measures of another, which other, with respect to those very measures, is declared to be supreme over that which exerts the control, are propositions not to be denied." (4 Wheaton, 431.)

The same principle has been recognized in the National Bank cases declaring the power of the States to tax the property and franchises of national banks only to the extent authorized by the laws of Congress. *Owensboro National Bank v. Owensboro* (173 U. S., 604) involved the validity of a franchise tax in Kentucky on national banks. In that case this court declared (pp. 608, 609) that the States were wholly without power to levy any tax directly or indirectly upon national banks, their property, assets, or franchises, except so far as the permissive legislation of Congress allowed such taxation; and the court declared that the right granted to tax the real estate of such banks and the shares in the names of the shareholders constituted the extent of the permission given by Congress, and any tax beyond these was declared to be void.

In *Farmers' Bank v. Minnesota* (232 U. S., 516) this court held that a State may not tax bonds issued by the municipality of a Territory; that to tax such bonds as property in the hands of the holder is, in the last analysis, an imposition upon the right of a municipality to issue them.

The exercise of such taxing power by the States might be so used as to hamper and destroy the exercise of authority conferred by Congress, and this justifies the exemption. If the States can tax these bonds, they may destroy the means provided for obtaining the necessary funds for the future operation of the banks. With the wisdom and policy of this legislation we have nothing to do. Ours is only the function of ascertaining whether Congress, in the creation of the banks, and in exempting these securities from taxation—Federal and State—has acted within the limits of its constitutional authority. For the reasons stated we think the contention of the Government and of the appellees that these banks are constitutionally organized and the securities here involved legally exempted from taxation must be sustained.

It follows that the decree of the district court is affirmed. Mr. Justice Brandeis took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

A true copy.
Test:

Clerk Supreme Court, United States.

Mr. WINGO. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. If he does not wish to respond, I will reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHELAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to do one thing, and one thing only.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. In just one minute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the gentleman in favor of the bill?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the gentleman from Arkansas in favor of the bill?

Mr. WINGO. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is everybody else in favor of the bill?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Then what on earth are we talking about? Why not vote?

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PHELAN. No; I will not yield to anybody.

I will tell the gentleman why I am talking. It is because two or three Members have asked me to talk and explain the bill, and some of the Members wanted to know what the bill was, and I will try to tell them.

When we put this farm loan act through, I, more than anybody else, was responsible for this five-year limitation. This was the situation: The mortgages are the security behind the bonds. The mortgages could be paid at any time within five years after they are due. In a new and untried system in which we had no experience I was not willing that bonds should be put out for a greater period of time than the possible length of the mortgages that were behind them. In other words, I did not want a situation to develop where farm-loan banks would have bonds out for 10 or 15 years and have the mortgages which were behind them paid in less time than that.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] was on the commission and argued as he did here to-night, and argued very well, that the rate would be better in the case of a long-time bond. I agreed with what he then said, and I agree with what he said to-night.

The thing I was afraid of, however, was that a number of new directors in a new system, men who had had no experience in this kind of work, might get the bank tied up in a position where there would be outstanding bonds on which they would have to pay interest, perhaps not sufficient mortgages outstanding and drawing interest with which to pay the bond interest. The European systems have almost uniformly made the length of the period of the mortgages and the minimum period of the bonds the same. The farm-loan system has now been running for some years. The Farm Loan Board inform us that they have bonds maturing frequently, so that they can safely have a longer minimum period. The act originally provided that there could not be a longer minimum period than 5 years. In other words, you could not have a bond that was not callable in 5 years. You could not have a bond outstanding that was callable in 6 or 8 years. Your bonds must all be callable in 5 years. They might, at the option of the bank, remain out for more than 5 years, but the bank must have the right to call them in 5 years. This bill provides that your bonds must be callable in 10 years. They might be callable in 8, 7, 6, or 5 years, but they can not be callable in 11, 12, or 13, or any period of years more than 10. That is all there is to the proposition.

Now, as to the market for the present bonds, it is the simplest matter in the world. It is a question of the kind of bargain that the banks can make. They ought to sell 10-year bonds on better terms than they sell 5-year bonds. They ought to get a little lower rate of interest on 10-year bonds than on 5-year bonds. If that is so as an ordinary proposition, and they can get a better rate of interest on a 10-year bond than they can on a 5-year bond, how is that going to affect the 5-year bonds that are outstanding? They sell the 10-year bond at a little lower rate. That is the only difference. Now, if it happens that these bonds which go out for 10 years sell at the same rate or a little higher rate than the 5-year bonds that are already outstanding, it is because the market is different. So that there is nothing at all to the argument which has been used that they are going to hurt the bonds already outstanding.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that under this legislation the bonds must be called in 10 years?

Mr. PHELAN. No; they must be callable in 10 years. A bank issues a bond which the bank has the right to call in 10 years.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken, and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 2, 1921.

HON. F. H. GILLET,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I desire to tender my resignation as a member on the part of the House on the Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Respectfully,

W. W. RUCKER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints in the place of Mr. RUCKER, Maj. STEDMAN, of North Carolina. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, had agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 22, 34, 54, 106, and 113, had insisted

upon its amendments Nos. 18, 23, 104, and 105, and had agreed to the further conference asked by the House, and had ordered that Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. NEW, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. MCKELLAR be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BURIAL OF AN UNKNOWN AMERICAN SOLDIER.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 426.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read House joint resolution 426, providing for the bringing to the United States of the body of an unknown American, who was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces, who served in Europe and lost his life during the World War, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to cause to be brought to the United States the body of an American, who was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces who served in Europe, who lost his life during the World War and whose identity has not been established, for burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va.

Such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

STANDING ROCK INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, take House joint resolution 346 from the Speaker's table, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GARD. I demand a second.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. I made the demand for a second in order that the gentleman might explain the difference between the bill as it passed the House and the Senate amendments.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, the only difference between the House bill and the Senate amendments is that they have added another reservation—the Cheyenne Reservation. It permits the extending of the time of payment to the Cheyenne Reservation in addition to the Standing Rock Reservation. The other amendments that are in the bill are to make the language of the bill conform to that added reservation.

The bill simply extends the time of payment one year on account of the crop conditions out in that country for the last year.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The House passes this resolution extending the time for the payment of the purchase money on homestead entries in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And the Senate puts in the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation, an entirely different reservation?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Here is a case where the House passes a bill extending the time of payment in one reservation, and having got that through some one goes to the Senate and adds an amendment to insert another Indian reservation in connection with it. I have no doubt the gentleman from North Dakota is acting in good faith. Then a motion is made to suspend the rules, nobody has reported on it, and nobody knows anything about it except the gentleman, and I assume that he does.

Mr. SINCLAIR. A report was submitted by Senator Smoot of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, they may know something about it in the Senate, but we know nothing about it in the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The Secretary of the Interior has reported on it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Then why was it not reported in the House in the proper way? Why pass a bill through the House and then go to the Senate and insert another reservation without anybody knowing anything about it?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I am not responsible for what was done in the Senate.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman is responsible for what he is trying to do in the House without any consideration by a committee of the House. It is an entirely different proposition and never has been considered in the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The matter has been done several times by the House in respect to other Indian reservations. The time of payment has been extended on several reservations.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I know, and I have voted for many of them. I voted intelligently, or at least with some information. Here we are asked to vote for one reservation without any knowledge or information at all.

Of course, I know that there have been times when gentlemen have passed bills through the House and have then gone to the Senate and had something added to them, and have had them finally passed without any consideration by the House of what has been added in the Senate. I do not believe the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SINCLAIR] is guilty of any bad faith to the House at all, but I do not think it is a very good way to do business.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the conditions in the Cheyenne Reservation are very similar to the conditions in the Standing Rock Reservation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Why did not the gentleman put it in his original proposition?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It was not called to my attention. It is in another State.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, that is it. Some Senator from another State said "I will let your bill pass if you will add something for my State," and it is now proposed to do that without any knowledge or information on the part of the House in respect to it. Is that the way we are doing business here?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The gentleman is drawing a wrong inference in that. I am here to speak only for my constituency, and my people asked me for this legislation and I brought it before the House. It passed the House in December without a dissenting vote.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes; but the gentleman's present proposition did not. Is there no one in the House who is asking for the Cheyenne Indian Reservation proposition?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The gentleman from Illinois knows more about it than I do.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not know anybody who is asking for it in the House. The gentleman proposes that we agree to a Senate amendment which is inserted and which he says he does not know anything about. If there is anybody in the House who does, I hope he will rise and come to the rescue.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we not know as much about this as we did about the post office in North Carolina?

Mr. SINCLAIR. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the House joint resolution.

The question was taken; and in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER, S. C.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 10963) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga., which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to J. J. Smith and J. E. McGee, both of Starr, S. C., and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "successors and".

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "at or".

Amend the title.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Haileys Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga."

RELIEVING ELECTORAL VOTE MESSENGERS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. J. Res. 248, relieving and discharging from the fine imposed by law and authorizing the payment of messengers appointed by the electors of certain States to deliver the electoral vote of such States for President and Vice President, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas certain of the messengers appointed by the electors of certain States failed, through incorrect legal advice, to deliver to the President of the Senate the certified copy of the electoral vote of such States for President and Vice President; and

Whereas certain messengers, learning of this erroneous advice, delivered such certificates after January 24 and before the passage of this act: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That messengers who failed to appear should be relieved and discharged from the \$1,000 fine for such neglect imposed and that the President of the Senate be directed to authorize the payment of such messengers as appeared before January 31, 1921.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many of these messengers are asking to be relieved?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I object, if the gentleman can not explain.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate joint resolution 248, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to suspend the rules and pass Senate joint resolution 248, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk again reported the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain how many of these messengers there are, and why it was they did not come down?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As I understand it there are three and possibly four. I am going to ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by making it read "On or before January 31, 1921," so as to include the fourth man.

The old law used to provide that the electoral vote should be delivered here on or before the first Wednesday in February. That law is changed. It now requires that the vote shall be delivered here on or before the fourth Monday in January. The secretaries of states in four States, at least, operating under the old law issued certificates to the messengers providing that they should report and deliver the vote on or before the first Wednesday in February.

Mr. WINGO. What States?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The State of Indiana was one, [Laughter.] The State of Utah another, the State of Maryland, I think, the third, and I am just informed by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SNYDER] that the State of Oregon is the fourth.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Is the gentleman's motion now in form so that it will take care of what he wishes to do? As I understand, the gentleman now wishes to amend by unanimous consent before this motion is voted upon. Had he not better secure that consent before we go ahead and consider this bill under suspension of the rules?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is what I am going to ask after this explanation.

Mr. McARTHUR. I want to say to the gentleman this resolution will have to be amended to include January 31, if he is going to take care of the Oregon man who did not get here until that day.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. On or before January 31.

Mr. McARTHUR. But the resolution says before January.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is the reason why I am asking unanimous consent to say on or before January 31.

Mr. TILSON. Had not the gentleman better do that at this time, because if somebody objects to it he may need to go over it again—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am now asking that the bill may be so amended as to read "on or before January 31, 1921."

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman has had the suspension of the rules accorded him for a certain proposition embraced in the bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARD. I do not know how it can be amended.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. WINGO. I think to save time the House will give unanimous consent.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In order that there may be no question about this thing I wish to offer just this word of explanation. I know that so far as the messenger from the State of Indiana is concerned that he was absolutely without fault and was acting entirely upon the certificate given him by the secretary of state, and I wish to say this, further: He was an old soldier, fought through the Civil War, spent a year in driving the French out of Mexico, looked upon this as a crowning honor and found it to be a humiliation, and I expect these other gentlemen acting in the same good faith came with the certificate and within the time only to find that they, too, were to be humiliated.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Who gave this information? This law has been in force for many years. Has there been any trouble about this before?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not know whether there has been or not. I know as far as the State of Indiana is concerned that the secretary of state so advised the messenger and issued the certificate accordingly, but the Vice President would not receive the electoral vote when it came here; only upon the condition that a new certificate should be had would he receive it, and the messenger was sent back to Indiana and got back here—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Most of these messengers this year were Republicans?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is impossible for me to believe they are more ignorant and less intelligent than the messengers four and eight years ago who were able to obey the law.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It might have been possible that the gentlemen whose duty it was to receive them were a little bit more critical than they were four years ago.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, that may be. I do not know.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Perhaps they had an old volume of the Statutes.

Mr. McARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. McARTHUR. I want to say in regard to the messenger from my State that he applied to the Secretary of State to know if it would be all right for him to get here on the first Monday in February.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I now ask for a suspension of the rules and the passage of Senate resolution 248, with an amendment on page 2, line 3, by adding before the word "before" the words "on or."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to amend the resolution in the manner in which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it not be better parliamentary practice for the gentleman to submit and have reread the proposition which he now offers under the suspension of the rules, rather than to have the amendment by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would save time. The Chair thinks if it were done by unanimous consent it would have to be read over again. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, insert before the word "before" the words "on or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER, NEAR SAVANNAH, GA.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10883) authorizing the counties of Beaufort, S. C., and Chatham, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Savannah, Ga.

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Beaufort, S. C., and Chatham, Ga., be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Savannah, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 15812. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 382. Joint resolution declaring that certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations shall be construed as if the war had ended and the present or existing emergency expired;

H. R. 15543. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10074. An act to enlarge the jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, and to regulate appeals from the judgments of said court, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13225. An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHAMP CLARK.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 8 o'clock p. m., March 3, there may be an hour in which Members shall have opportunity to deliver addresses upon the life, character, and public services of the late CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that to-morrow evening at 8 o'clock an hour be set apart for memorial exercises on the late Hon. CHAMP CLARK. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolutions:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,

March 2, 1921.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHAMP CLARK, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of the House be appointed to take order for superintending the funeral of Mr. CLARK in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes antemeridian, on Saturday, March 5, instant, and that the Members of the present House and of the House elect attend the same.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect, the remains of Mr. CLARK be removed from Washington to Bowling Green, Mo., in charge of the Sergeant at Arms, attended by the committee, who shall have full power to carry these resolutions into effect, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House communicate these proceedings to the Senate and invite the Vice President, the Vice President elect, the Members of the Senate, and the Members of the Senate elect to attend the funeral in the Hall of the House of Representatives; and that the Senate be invited to appoint a committee to act with the committee of the House.

Resolved, That invitations be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the President elect and the members designate of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and the Associate

Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the Chief of Naval Operations, and the General of the Army to attend the funeral in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

COMMEMORATION COIN—ADMISSION OF MISSOURI INTO UNION.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 4893.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 4893) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution similar in terms to that passed at the last Congress in reference to Massachusetts?

Mr. VESTAL. In the same language.

Mr. GARD. And with the same governmental safeguards?

Mr. VESTAL. The same safeguards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union there shall be coined at the mints of the United States 50-cent pieces to the number of 250,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard Troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

SEC. 2. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. VESTAL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CRADOCK, VA.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate bill 4924.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to suspend the rules and pass Senate bill 4924. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4924) to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation Project 150A, located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Cradock.

Be it enacted, etc., That the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired over the said town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation Project 150A and called Cradock, and located in the county of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be, and the same is hereby, retroceded to the State of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLACK. I demand a second.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. I am not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT] asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is a bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia jurisdiction over a tract of land down in Cradock, Norfolk County, Va. During the World War the Housing Corporation built quite an extensive city there and the State of Virginia ceded to the United States Government jurisdiction over this property.

Now, that the war is over, the Government has sold to different individuals all of the houses in that town, and the Government owns at this time the public utility plants that it built there for its own use. There is a town or city without a city government, and it can have no city government until the State

of Virginia acquires jurisdiction over this land, so that the town can be incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia. When the retrocession is made the town can be incorporated and its citizens can levy taxes upon themselves, and they can buy these public utilities that the Government owns that have been left over from the war.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose this bill passes, and the jurisdiction is conferred on the State of Virginia, what becomes of the title of the United States Government to these utilities?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The titles to the utilities remain with the United States until the United States conveys them over. The United States has already deeded the land. This is governmental jurisdiction that it is ceding back.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND] represents the district in which this is located, and is looking after the interests of the people there; and I yield five minutes to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can add anything to what has already been said by the gentleman from Indiana. So far as the utilities are concerned, I would say that the Government still owns them. Cradock is an orphan child of the Housing Corporation, absolutely without any local government. The Government has disposed of its property to private individuals, but still holds jurisdiction over it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. If the Government has ceded its title to private individuals, why is it necessary to have a government there?

Mr. HOLLAND. Because the United States still has jurisdiction over this property. The State of Virginia ceded jurisdiction to the United States Government.

Mr. BLACK. And it is now necessary, notwithstanding the conveyance of title to these private individuals, that this governmental authority be conferred?

Mr. HOLLAND. The United States district court of Virginia has held that it is essential that jurisdiction shall be ceded back to the State of Virginia before they can organize any local government. There is no legal entity with which any contract for light, or water, or anything else can be made. As soon as jurisdiction is ceded back these people can organize under the State laws.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to consume any time on the particular bill in question, but I have a letter from the Postmaster General that I would like to have read in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read it.

Mr. WALSH. What is it about? Is it about this bill?

Mr. BLACK. It is not about this bill. But I have been asked to make it public. It contains certain information about postal robberies that is pertinent at this time. If anybody objects to it as being out of order, all right.

Mr. KING. Has the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] objected?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have not. The gentleman asked to have this read in his own time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1921.

HON. EUGENE BLACK,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLACK: I thank you for the opportunity to glance at the newspaper clippings relating to accidents in the air mail service and the robberies of the mails which have recently taken place.

We all recognize that the air mail is a pioneer service and that, in the nature of things, accidents will occur. Some people, with small intellect, never seem able to grasp the point made in the couplet:

"Mother, may I go out to swim;

"Yes, yes, you may, my daughter;

"Hang your clothes on a hickory limb

"But don't go near the water."

Of course, I am indifferent to contemptible insinuations directed against the Postal Establishment by such newspapers as the New York Herald. Every person whose good opinion is worth while knows that base and unconscionable partisanship is the animus of attacks made by such newspapers.

Intelligent people know the causes underlying the crime wave which has recently swept over the country, finding its most acute expressions on Broadway and Fifth Avenue, New York. The unusual number of mail robberies at this period are mere incidents of the nation-wide and, in fact, the world-wide, wave of crime. A condition of great unrest exists everywhere, manifesting itself in disregard of personal and property rights, accompanied by attacks upon the foundation of government itself. How could the safety of the mails fail to be affected by such conditions?

An important factor making for the development of crime in the United States is the disposition on the part of certain judicial officers, notably in New York City, Washington, and Chicago, to impose nominal

punishments when criminals are apprehended. It frequently happens that a day's confinement in jail is given upon a plea of guilty for theft from the mails, and it also often occurs that judges of bolshevistic tendencies, who from motives of policy had theretofore managed to conceal such feelings, find occasion for expressing sympathy for the criminal or make excuses for the crime committed.

A criminal instinct or predisposition is the basic cause of bolshevistic tendencies, and this applies to those in judicial place as well as to others.

Furthermore, the enactment of laws which are unsupported by public opinion, and for this reason unenforceable, provoke frequent and widespread breaches of such laws, thus engendering in the public mind disrespect for all laws and encouraging those who have criminal inclinations to law violation.

Another encouragement to crime commission is the mendacious and salacious policy pursued by a commercialized press. Newspapers, with of course some exceptions, not only spread before helpless readers day after day extended accounts, in utmost detail, of murders, robberies, divorces, and crimes of all sorts, but when law violators are apprehended and arrested they often treat in a maudlin, sentimental way, always characterized by the most yellow sensationalism, the crime committed, the criminal, and the various members of his family. This frequently results in eliciting the well-meaning but misdirected sympathy of a lot of sentimental reformers or self-constituted reform organizations, which have interfered with law enforcement until it has reached a point where criminals no longer fear the penalties of law violation. This, of course, through the power of suggestion, encourages others to like crimes. Such newspapers have not only become a menace to society but are becoming a danger to government itself.

This may not be palatable reading, but it is God's virgin truth, and I have hoped that the time would come when some one would have the courage to speak out in meeting.

The efficiency of the Post Office inspection force is such that no one will question the assertion that a larger percentage of those committing crimes against the United States mails are apprehended than in any other class of crimes committed.

These are the only comments I desire to make upon the clippings.

Again, thanking you, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

A. S. BUNLSON.

During the reading,

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the further reading.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks consent has been given.

Mr. KING. It is not addressed to the question before the House.

The SPEAKER. That is very true, but the gentleman should have objected when consent was asked.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman said that it would take only five minutes.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the letter.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question being taken, and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ANTHONY. I submit a conference report on the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 15943) for printing under the rule, for the information of the House.

PROPERTY OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3750) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for the loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, as amended by the act of July 9, 1918, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of the claims of officers and enlisted men of the Army for loss of private property destroyed in the military service of the United States," approved March 3, 1885, as amended by the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat., p. 880), be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That private property belonging to officers, enlisted men, and members of the Nurse Corps (female) of the Army, including all prescribed articles of equipment and clothing which they are required by law or regulation to own and use in the performance of their duties, and horses and equipment required by law or regulations to be provided by mounted officers, which since the 5th day of April, 1917, has been or shall hereafter be lost, damaged, or destroyed in the military service, shall be replaced, or the damage thereto, or its value recouped to the owner as hereinafter provided, when such loss, damage, or destruction has occurred or shall hereafter occur without fault or negligence on the part of the owner in any of the following circumstances:

"First. When such private property so lost, damaged, or destroyed was shipped on board an unseaworthy vessel by order of an officer authorized to give such order or direct such shipment.

"Second. When it appears that such private property was so lost, damaged, or destroyed in consequence of its owner having given his attention to the saving of human life or property belonging to the United States which was in danger at the same time and under similar circumstances, or while, at the time of such loss, damage, or destruction, the claimant was engaged in authorized military duties in connection therewith.

"Third. When during travel under orders such private property, including the regulating allowance of baggage, transferred by a common carrier, or otherwise transported by the proper agent or agency of the United States Government, is lost, damaged, or destroyed; but replacement, recoupment, or commutation in these circumstances, where the property was or shall be transported by a common carrier, shall

be limited to the extent of such loss, damage, or destruction over and above the amount recoverable from said carrier.

"Fourth. When such private property is destroyed or captured by the enemy, or is destroyed to prevent its falling into the hands of the enemy, or is abandoned on account of lack of transportation or by reason of military emergency requiring its abandonment, or is otherwise lost in the field during campaign.

"Sec. 2. That except as to such property as by law or regulation is required to be possessed and used by officers, enlisted men, and members of the Army Nurse Corps (female), respectively, the liability of the Government under this act shall be limited to damage to or loss of such sums of money or such articles of personal property as the Secretary of War shall decide or declare to be reasonable, useful, necessary, and proper for officers, enlisted men, or members of the Army Nurse Corps (female), respectively, as the case may be, to have in their possession while in quarters, or in the field, engaged in the public service in the line of duty.

"Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to examine into, ascertain, and determine the value of such property lost, destroyed, captured, or abandoned as specified in the foregoing paragraphs, or the amount of damage thereto, as the case may be; and the amount of such value or damage so ascertained and determined shall be paid by disbursing officers of the Army, or such property lost, destroyed, captured, or abandoned, or so damaged as to be unfit for service, may be replaced in kind from Government property on hand when the Secretary of War shall so direct.

"Sec. 4. That the tender of replacement or of commutation or the determination made by the Secretary of War upon a claim presented, as provided for in the foregoing section, shall constitute a final determination of any claim cognizable under this chapter, and such claim shall not thereafter be reopened or considered.

"Sec. 5. That no claim arising under this act shall be considered unless made within two years from the time that it accrued, except that when a claim accrues in time of war, or when war intervenes within two years after its accrual, such claim may be presented within two years after peace is established.

"Sec. 6. That for the payment of claims arising and established under this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000.

"Sec. 7. That so much of the act of March 28, 1918 (40 Stat., pp. 479, 180), as makes provision for the presentation, adjustment, and payment of claims of officers and enlisted men for loss of private property destroyed in the military service be, and the same hereby is, repealed."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GARD. I demand a second.

Mr. CRAGO. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum of the House is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, March 3, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

430. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting a letter calling attention to schedule of useless files of papers and records of the office of the superintendent of documents to be disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

431. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations, required by the Public Health Service for improvement at quarantine stations at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore (H. Doc. No. 1017); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a list of useless papers of the Bureau of Naturalization of the Department of Labor, to be destroyed; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

433. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Coosa River, Ga. and Ala. (H. Doc. No. 1018); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14667) to regulate grain exchanges, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a re-

port (No. 1401), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRAND, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15191) to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913, providing for discount of notes, drafts, and bills of exchange of factors, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1402), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15373) to amend the United States cotton futures act by inserting therein a new section for American Egyptian cotton only, to be known as section 5A, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1403), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 478) requesting suspension of speculative short sales, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1404), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 479) requesting suspension of speculative short sales, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1405), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DYER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report (No. 1407) on the impeachment charges against Kenesaw Mountain Landis, which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 16161) to amend the United States warehouse act of August 11, 1916, to make it possible for individual farmers to store and finance their grain and market it direct through negotiable warehouse receipts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRINSON: A bill (H. R. 16162) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Goldsboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 16163) to extend marketing of agricultural and live stock products and to establish therefor a bureau in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring H. R. 15854, to promote Maj. Gen. Liggett to the rank of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting the enactment of House bill 15854, by which the rank of lieutenant general will be restored to Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment by Congress of legislation which will prevent the use of destructive fishing gear in the waters of the Pacific Ocean bordering on the United States and the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under Clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 16165) for the relief of the Charlestown Sand & Stone Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 16166) granting a pension to Hattie Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16167) granting a pension to Elizabeth Yeatts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 16168) granting a pension to Mary A. Clegg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 16169) to authorize appropriation of \$250,000, to be paid out of the Treasury by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Central Storage Co., of San Angelo, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6208. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Waverly Council No. 138, New York City, urging the passage of the

Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6209. Also, petition of the National Association of Manufacturers, New York City, protesting against the Federal coal bill and the Federal live-stock commission bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6210. By Mr. ACKERMAN: Petition of citizens of Plainfield, N. J., favoring the passage of S. 4554 and H. R. 14469, known as the national park bills; to the Committee on Water Power.

6211. By Mr. BENHAM: Petition of Rev. Conrad Held and sundry citizens of Batesville, Ind., concerning the French army of occupation in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6212. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition adopted in mass meeting at Galveston, urging immediate recognition of the Irish republic and requesting the Government to immediately recall loan made to Great Britain during the World War; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6213. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Rev. Rudolph E. W. Riemann, pastor, and the trustees of St. Jakobi Church, Richmond, Mich., protesting against the presence of colored French troops in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6214. By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of Sacre-Coeur Council, No. 371, l'Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amerique, Acadia, Me., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6215. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of certain citizens of Batavia, Ohio, concerning the French army of occupation in Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6216. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Merchants & Manufacturers' Association, Baltimore, urging appropriation to take care of impending danger from typhus epidemic; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6217. Also, petition of the Holland Manufacturing Co., Baltimore, favoring a tariff for protection of industry against serious foreign competition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6218. Also, petition of Mayor William F. Broening, Baltimore, urging emergency appropriation for Baltimore quarantine asked by Public Health; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6219. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. McCloskey, C. E. Doyle, Mrs. Mary L. Booth, and John P. Donahue, all of Baltimore, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6220. By Mr. MCGLENNON: Petition of members of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church, of Hoboken, N. J., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6221. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of members of the Swedish Evangelical Lutheran Lebanon Church, of Whitehall, Mich., protesting against the occupation of German territory by French Negro troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6222. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the Council of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, asking that the United States Public Health Service locate one of the \$2,500,000 hospitals for disabled ex-service men in that city; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6223. Also, petition of certain citizens of the twentieth district of Ohio, favoring the recognition of the Irish republic and protesting against the deportation of O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6224. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of numerous citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging an amendment to the Volstead Act that will permit the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6225. Also, petition of many citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for severe restrictions regarding work and the enjoyment of innocent pastimes on Sunday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6226. By Mr. PAIGE: Petitions of Rochambeau Council, No. 12, l'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Southbridge, Mass.; Dollard des Ormeaux Council, No. 90, l'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Webster, Mass.; Richelleu Council, No. 193, l'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, West Warren, Mass.; Brochu Council, No. 62, l'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Southbridge, Mass.; and Marie Antoinette Council, No. 267, l'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, Spencer, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6227. By Mr. PATTERSON: Petition of the Salem Monthly Meeting of Friends, Salem, N. J., opposing compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6228. By Mr. RIDDICK: Petition of residents of Custer County, Mont., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6229. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of the Centralville Social Club, of Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6230. Also, petition of J. N. Jacques Council, No. 217, l'Union St. Jean-Baptiste d'Amerique, Lowell, Mass., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6231. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, requesting funds for effective quarantine improvement in our larger ports; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6232. Also, petition of St. Vincent de Paul Conference of the Church of St. Thomas the Apostle, of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6233. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Arthur A. Shurtleff, in favor of the Esch bill, H. R. 14469, and the Jones bill, S. 4534; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6234. Also, petition of Henry M. Foote, in favor of Senate bill 2252, paying the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on War Claims.

6235. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Tuberculosis League, regarding Robinson amendment, transferring Fort Roots, at Little Rock, from the War Department to the Public Health Department; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6236. Also, petition of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, of Boston, Mass., concerning appropriation for blister-rust control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6237. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of J. M. Hammer, of Pittsburgh, Pa., editor, box 555, protesting against the importation of glassware into the United States in the production of which child labor enters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6238. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Napoleon, Ohio, protesting against the use by the Republic of France of uncivilized colored troops in the occupied districts of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 3, 1921.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 2, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhues, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4224) to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation project 150A, located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Craddock.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10883. An act authorizing the counties of Beaufort, S. C., and Chatham, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Savannah, Ga.;

H. R. 10963. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River near Hailers Ferry, and between the counties of Anderson, S. C., and Hart, Ga.;

H. J. Res. 426. Joint resolution providing for the bringing to the United States of the body of an unknown American, who was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces, who served in Europe and lost his life during the World War, and for the burial of the remains with appropriate ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution making appropriation to pay the widow of Champ Clark.

The message further announced that the House had passed, with an amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 248) relieving and discharging from the fine imposed by law and authorizing the payment of messengers appointed by the electors of certain States to deliver the electoral vote of such States for President and Vice President, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Asburat	Glass	Lodge	Shields
Ball	Gooding	McCumber	Simmons
Borah	Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Hale	McLean	Smith, Md.
Calder	Harris	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Harrison	Moses	Smoot
Chamberlain	Heflin	Myers	Spencer
Culberson	Henderson	Nelson	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Swanson
Dial	Kellogg	Owen	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Phipps	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Pittman	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Poindexter	Wadsworth
Fernald	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Freelighuysen	Knox	Reed	Warren
Gay	La Follette	Robinson	Watson
Gerry	Lenroot	Sheppard	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is about 24 hours until, according to the Constitution of the United States, this session of Congress will end. From the experience that we have had in the attempt to pass the naval appropriation bill during the last four days, it is perfectly evident that it is utterly impossible to enact the bill into law at the present session of Congress. That being the case, I do not feel like assuming the responsibility of holding the time of the Senate to keep the bill under consideration, as a mere mummery of legislation, which can not result in any positive law, thereby preventing the consideration of a great many important and vital measures which are pending in the Senate and ready for senatorial action. I regret very much that already we have interfered with some of those measures. I think during the effort to get consideration of the naval appropriation bill we have caused a delay of three or four hours in the great, vital, national measure of a bridge across the Pee Dee Creek—or something like that—in South Carolina. I do not desire to stand in the way of measures of that kind.

Of course, there are a number of circumstances which have brought about a failure of the naval appropriation bill. The chief of them, I am perfectly frank to say, was the late date at which it was received from the House of Representatives. It was not received from the House of Representatives until February 15. As it came from the House of Representatives, the bill was in such form that, if it had been enacted into law, it would have led to the demoralization of the American Navy and to a paralysis of the great organization which has been undertaken and in progress successfully under the new plan of naval development which has grown out of the preparedness which was forced upon this country by the great European war.

The bill as it came from the House, leaving out of consideration certain fixed charges and considering those items which are appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the fighting force of the Navy, contained an amount approximately double that which was carried by the naval appropriation bill of 1916. Since 1916 the pay of American sailors has been doubled, the cost of rations for the Navy has been increased twofold, the wages of civilian employees are double what they were in 1916, the cost of material for the construction of ships and the other necessary work which enters into the Naval Establishment is twice what it was in 1916, so that if the bill had been passed by the Senate in that form it would have provided only for the maintenance in 1921, with all the military development of the world since 1916, for a 1916 Navy.

The bill as it came from the House contained no appropriation for aircraft. Great Britain is estimating and appropriating in her great aviation establishment for the current year 125,000,000 pounds sterling. The naval bill as it came from the House carried not a dollar for new aircraft or the construction or procurement of new aircraft. All the great naval powers in the world are providing the necessary necessities of naval aviation service, such as ships called airplane carriers, upon which airplanes are carried to the vicinity of the scene of action. The House bill provided nothing whatever for the construction of such ships, although at the present time we have none at all